

The Nation

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1915.

Summary of the News

The delicate relations of the United States and Germany have been somewhat overshadowed during the past week by the adventures of the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, Dr. Constantin Dumba, whose recall was asked by the American Government on September 9. On that day the Government at Vienna was informed through Ambassador Penfield of the President's decision in a note, which in part reads as follows: "By reason of the admitted purpose and intent of Mr. Dumba to conspire to cripple legitimate industries of the people of the United States and to interrupt their legitimate trade, and by reason of the flagrant violation of diplomatic propriety in employing an American citizen protected by an American passport as a secret bearer of official dispatches through the lines of the enemy of Austria-Hungary, the President directs me to inform your Excellency that Mr. Dumba is no longer acceptable to the Government of the United States as the Ambassador of his Imperial Majesty at Washington."

This issue was precipitated by the detection by English authorities of a letter to his Government written by Dr. Dumba and entrusted to the care of James F. Archibald, who was travelling under the protection of an American passport. In this letter Dr. Dumba stated: "I am under the impression that we could, if not entirely prevent the production of war material in Bethlehem and in the Middle West, at any rate strongly disorganize it and hold it up for months, which, according to the statement of the German Military Attaché, is of great importance, and which amply outweighs the relatively small sacrifice of money." Mr. Archibald, meanwhile, has been forced to return to this country, and will, it is understood, be arrested by Federal authorities when he reaches New York. To what extent the Military Attaché to the German Embassy, Capt. von Papen, is involved in this plot to interrupt the American production of munitions of war is not generally known, but his sudden departure for the Yellowstone is taken to mean that his usefulness at Washington is at an end.

Germany's explanation of the sinking of the White Star liner Arabic on August 19 was received at the State Department on September 9, having been delivered to Ambassador Gerard on the evening of the 7th. This memorandum, contrary to affidavits of the ship's passengers, asserts that the Arabic altered her course in such a way as to lead the commander of the submarine to believe that his craft was about to be rammed, and that in self-defence he was forced to fire a torpedo. A significant statement follows the expression of regret that American citizens should have lost their lives, viz.: "The German Government is unable, however, to acknowledge any obligation to grant indemnity in the matter, even if the commander should have been mistaken as to the aggressive intentions of the Arabic." In case a har-

monious opinion cannot be reached by the two Governments, it is suggested that the differences be submitted to the Hague Tribunal for arbitration, with the provision, however, that "the arbitral decision shall not be admitted to have the importance of a general decision on the permissibility or the converse under international law of German submarine warfare."

The terms of this memorandum leave the possibility of a settlement of German-American differences further from realization than one would have suspected from the positive assurances given by Count von Bernstorff a fortnight ago. Then it was predicted that Germany would accede to the general principle concerning submarine warfare for which President Wilson has all along been contending. As we write, the discouraging outlook has been somewhat brightened by a conversation between the German Ambassador and Secretary Lansing on Monday.

On September 9 sentence was passed on Gustave Stahl, who pleaded guilty to perjury in having made an affidavit that he saw four guns mounted on the Lusitania. Stahl was sentenced to serve a term of eighteen months in the penitentiary at Atlanta.

After repeated unsuccessful attempts, German Zeppelins reached London the middle of last week, killing in that city and in the English east coast counties 33 persons and injuring 129 in raids of two successive nights.

The German submarines, since our last record, have sunk four British, one Russian, and three French steamships, besides a British trawler.

In view of his skilful retreat before the German invasion, the news of the Grand Duke Nicholas's transfer to the command of the Russian campaign in the Caucasus has come as a great surprise to the Allies, as well as to Berlin and Vienna. Coincident with this extraordinary change, the Russians took the occasion for making a stubborn stand that was partly a vigorous offensive at Tarnopol September 8, in which it was asserted that 200 officers, 8,000 men, and 30 field guns were captured. This victory was later denied from Berlin. Again at Trembowla a Petrograd dispatch claims a victory over Austro-Hungarian forces, which, in conjunction with the previous victory at Tarnopol, is said to have netted more than 15,000 prisoners.

The full details for the reasons underlying the transfer of that able commander, the Grand Duke, are still to learn. While paying a chary tribute to his acknowledged prowess, Berlin papers have assumed that the change was necessary and inevitable in the light of the steady retreat before the victorious Teutonic armies. London, on the other hand, pays an unstinted eulogy, and emphasizes the new significance that the hitherto desultory fighting in the Caucasus has assumed since the Allies have begun to make their offensive felt at Constantinople.

The only news of definite importance from the western front has concerned the renewal

of desperate fighting in the Argonne and the apparently costly attempt of the Crown Prince's army in its endeavor to force the Verdun barrier. Two divisions of Germans attacked the French lines near Fontaine-aux-Charmes on the night of September 8. By the aid of asphyxiating gas, they gained a section of the French lines from 300 to 500 yards in extent. The magnitude of this gain has been denied by the French War Office. Paris maintains that the greater part of the lost ground has been recovered. French official figures assert heavy losses for the Germans on this occasion, and estimate that the Crown Prince's army in the several attempts has lost upwards of 100,000, one corps alone losing 40,000 men from the ranks. Since the failure of the first drive the French profess to have rendered Verdun, the Crown Prince's objective, well nigh impregnable.

The situation in the Balkans remains much what it was when we last wrote. Bulgaria is apparently still negotiating with both parties to the war, and has meantime reached an agreement with Turkey by which it receives the rights of the Dedeaghat Railway and a strip of territory two kilometres broad along the left bank of the Maritza. The bid of Servia for Bulgarian support has not been accepted, and Greece is likewise unable to meet Bulgaria's demands in Macedonia.

On September 10 the State Department received the long-awaited reply of Gen. Venustiano Carranza to the invitation, proffered on August 15 by the United States and diplomatic representatives of the Latin-American States, to confer with the leaders of various factions in Mexico in an effort to bring about peace. While declining the tender of mediation on the part of any foreign Government, Gen. Carranza takes it upon himself, as the leader of the Constitutionalist army, to invite the American representatives to a conference with him, to be held in one of the frontier towns on the Rio Grande, and suggests that, if these representatives consider that he is maintaining a *de facto* government in the republic, they recommend its recognition by their respective countries. It seems not unlikely that Gen. Carranza's invitation to meet with him in conference will be accepted.

Secretary Daniels announced on September 12 the personnel of the Naval Advisory Board of Inventions, the committee of experts who will recommend improvements for the navy. Besides the chairman, Thomas A. Edison, the Board includes the following: W. R. Whitney, L. H. Baekeland, Frank Julian Sprague, Benjamin G. Lamme, R. S. Woodward, Arthur Gordon Webster, A. M. Hunt, Alfred Craven, Spencer Miller, William Le Roy Emmett, Matthew B. Sellers, Hudson Maxim, Peter Cooper Hewitt, Thomas Robbins, Howard E. Coffin, Andrew J. Riker, Henry A. Wise Wood, Elmer A. Sperry, William L. Saunders, Benjamin B. Thayer, J. W. Richards, and Lawrence Addicks.

The proposed new Constitution for New York State was adopted by the Constitutional Convention, in session at Albany, on September 10, by a vote of 118 to 33, Tammany voting solidly against it.

The Week

The text of the German note on the sinking of the Arabic is, in the main, substantially what had been indicated in the newspaper dispatches. The bearing of its explanation and defence of the act upon the situation opened by the sinking of the Lusitania, and apparently closed by Count Bernstorff's note to Secretary Lansing on September 1, are discussed in other columns. There is, however, one passage in the note handed to Ambassador Gerard by the German Foreign Office which is of the gravest importance, and which had not been forecast in the unofficial dispatches. We refer to this remarkable and unambiguous announcement:

The German Government is unable, however, to acknowledge any obligation to grant indemnity in the matter, even if the commander should have been mistaken as to the aggressive intentions of the Arabic.

This evidently offers matter for the most careful and anxious consideration by Secretary Lansing and President Wilson. Does it mean that the German Government regards the assertion of any of its naval officers on every question of this kind as the last word in the matter? Does it mean that neither the judgment nor the veracity nor the *bona fides* of any such officer is ever to be open to question? If this is what it means, what is the value in practice of an assurance of safety by the German Government, however complete it might be in theory? If this is not what it means, what precisely does it mean? These are questions which cannot be ignored, if we are to know where we stand in the whole matter.

The most interesting sequel to the Dumba affair is the denunciation of his activities by the "white slaves" for whom he felt so much sympathy—after they engaged in the manufacture of munitions. It must be a shock to the Ambassador to find the Slavonic Club of South Boston resolving that "as long as the pay and conditions are in keeping with the work performed, no appeal will be listened to by Czechs and Slovaks on the ground of loyalty to the Hapsburgs"; to find the Slavonic Political Federation of New York emphatically proclaiming that they will always oppose "the anti-American and anti-Allies propaganda in this country," inasmuch as 1,000,000 of their people were driven from Austria-Hungary by political and economic abuses. As for the Middle West, the Bohemian National Alliance, the Croatian League, and the Slovak Guards

have in mass meeting in Chicago contradicted his insulting references to their ignorance, and declared their intention to stand their ground. Such declarations put it beyond a doubt that any permanent or temporary stoppage of the output of munitions by a mere open appeal to these races was impossible, and that no one acquainted with them could think it anything else. Dr. Dumba pretends that he was actuated by a humanitarian motive; the Austro-Hungarians remind him that they come by shiploads to improve their condition, that they are able to take care of themselves, and that his interest is suspiciously sudden. When Dr. Dumba appeals to their patriotism, they reply with declarations of indifference or of sympathy for the Allies.

"One fact is lacking," says the New York *World* editorially, "in the amazing story the *World* told Monday of an attempt, at a cost of more than \$1,000,000, to tie up shipments of freight from the United States. In all else the account of the strike that failed is complete. The missing fact is the name of the paymaster." We are by no means desirous of belittling the importance of the *World's* exposure; but it is evident that the assessment of its importance must turn on that "missing fact." That a nefarious plot in the interest of Germany and Austria was being hatched; that the plot was one which, if executed, would have meant most serious trouble and injury to this country; that to several persons connected with labor organizations, including the president of the International 'Longshoremen's Union, belongs the credit of faithful and effective work in frustration and exposure of the scheme—all this seems fully proved by the *World's* documentary evidence. But whether any person in the service of the German or the Austro-Hungarian Government was at the bottom of the attempted conspiracy is wholly open to doubt. So long as no evidence on this point is adduced, it is entirely possible that the scheme was hatched in the mind of some unauthorized pro-German plotter, without any official aid or connivance. What our own Government's Secret Service may have discovered in regard to it, we are unable to say or to conjecture. In view, however, of the recent revelations concerning Dr. Dumba, it would be fully as rash to assume the absence of Teutonic official connivance with the plot as to assert that it must have had official backing.

If President Wilson is harassed by diplomatic difficulties, created by the war, his

burdens must be increased rather than diminished by the appeals, public and private, that are poured upon him to do something to stop the conflict. The most popular way of making these appeals just now is apparently through the Pope, who is reported as being deluged with requests from both neutral and belligerent countries, to intercede with Wilson to hasten action leading to the opening of negotiations for peace. It is easy to understand the impulse behind these appeals, even if one dismisses the hypothesis that at present they are secretly encouraged by persons of influence who would like to see Germany realize upon her Russian successes. But, harsh as it may sound, they do credit to the appealers' hearts rather than to their heads. Everybody who has been favored with an expression upon the subject from Wilson is keenly aware that the individual who most desires to exert the full weight of his force, personal and official, in the direction of a cessation of hostilities is the President of the United States. He is known to regard such action as the greatest opportunity that could possibly come to him. But he is conscious, as too many of his petitioners are not, that nothing is to be gained, but much to be lost, by a precipitate move, and especially by repeated moves that come to naught. Such measures would only cheapen the whole idea of mediation and render it more difficult of application when the right moment arrived.

Lloyd George's preface to the forthcoming volume of his speeches on the war lacks nothing in that grim frankness that is now characteristic of the utterances of English leaders on the crisis they are facing. Nor, so far as one can judge from this distance, is there any of that disposition to cry "pessimist" that was evident when Kitchener, so early in the contest, made his famous remark about a three years' war. The new element in Lloyd George's pronouncement is his open recognition that Great Britain must play the leading part on the side of the Allies, not merely because she is richer and more efficient than her associates, but because, as things stand after twelve months of struggle, she is the only one possessed of large reserves of men and material that are capable of being rapidly drawn upon. Russia, says Lloyd George plainly, has suffered a shock that "for the time being" has ended "her contribution to the struggle for European freedom," while France is already bearing about all that can be expected of

her. In this writing of Russia off the books for a while, there may be a little of that rhetorical exaggeration which depicted indifference in English breasts at the very moment that recruiting was becoming satisfactory. Yet the net effect of Lloyd George's estimate of the situation is only to express as a *fait accompli* what everybody foresaw from the very beginning—that the ultimate phase of a prolonged contest would be a duel between Germany and Great Britain. Russia sufficiently demonstrated the weakness of Austria months ago. Now as clear-headed and resolute a man as England has confesses that on her side, too, there is one antagonist that must be prepared in mind and body to bear the brunt of an unprecedented burden.

We are glad to call attention to a communication in our correspondence columns, entitled "A Word to the Moderately Rich," both because of the spirit which prompted it and because of the situation which it accurately depicts. That the author of this letter, though a professional man and hence presumably not in a position to amass a large fortune, has been stirred to a deep sense of responsibility by the desperate plight of the sufferers from the European war, is an example which should open the eyes of many to the fact that Americans of means, in spite of the help they have given, have not as a rule imposed any real sacrifice upon themselves. We have before reminded our readers that the present emergency is one which calls for an expression of the utmost humanity on the part of us all, and that many could add enormously to their customary charities without embarrassment. By means of the various organized funds giving is made easy for those who, though charitably inclined, might otherwise excuse themselves on the ground of the trouble to which they would be put. It is a shocking thought that, with the continuance of the war, not only are Americans not giving aid to the downtrodden in anything like the measure of which they are capable, but are settling back into a humdrum existence, their emotions surfeited by all the calamities of which they have read. It is because of this unfortunate state that we welcome most heartily such a symptom of the contrary as the letter which we print to-day, and trust that it may meet with a generous response from our readers.

Carranza's reply to the invitation that he join in a conference with representatives

of the United States and certain of the Latin-American countries to consider the question of restoring peace in Mexico is an invitation that they join in a conference with him to consider the question of recognizing him as the *de facto* head of the Mexican Government. This rejection of the proposal worked out at Washington is in perfect tone; there is nothing of the arrogant military victor about it. On the contrary, Carranza—through his "Secretary in charge of Foreign Relations"—is careful to express his conviction of the "sincerity and the noble desires of the Governments" behind the "courteous invitation." His rejection of that invitation he puts upon two grounds: the undesirability of foreign intervention in a country's internal affairs, and his command of the situation by means of an army controlling "the greater part of the national domain." The first of these points, however strong in theory, must, in the present instance, depend for its force upon the validity of the second. Here Carranza is undoubtedly in a much more tenable position than he was when the invitation to him was framed. He stands at last, if appearances are to be trusted, the only powerful chieftain in his distracted country. This must be a leading consideration at the next meeting of the Ambassadors who offered the invitation and who have now to decide upon what action they will take in view of the acceptance of their advances by the minor leaders and the rejection of them by the most important one.

Attorney-General Gregory's opinion that a large proportion of foreign ships and all foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry are exempt from the life-saving regulations laid down by the Seamen's act will be a sad blow to La Follette and Furuseth. Indeed, Solicitor Thurston holds that the opinion will exempt from the regulations the vessels of virtually all the great maritime nations. The ruling applies to the ships of those lands whose navigation laws "approximate" our own, and there are few important countries in which they do not. To the complaint of our shipping interests upon the burdensomeness of the life-saving provisions the authors of the act have always replied that they would apply equally to all foreign vessels touching our ports, and that competitive conditions would thus be untouched. Now there will be significant inequalities in equipment requirements, and the tendency of our vessels to use foreign flags will be increased. It is true that the decision in no way affects the act's sections

regarding wages, hours, quarters, and the punishment of sailors in foreign countries, and from La Follette's point of view it is well that they are left intact. But they are the very sections which are certain, in their application to all ships, to involve us in treaty difficulties with other nations.

The passage in Porto Rico of a new homestead law, opening 150,000 acres of old Spanish crown lands to the people, is a step made imperative by the rapid growth of the island in population. The first American census, that of 1900, showed 950,000; a counting just completed shows 1,250,000, which is an increase of 130,000 since 1910 alone. The little possession now has 350 people to the square mile, or slightly more than New Jersey; and the emigration is negligible. Generous homestead laws are the more needed in that there have never been many small freeholders, most of the tracts having been held and cultivated in units of great acreage. The Government has steadily attempted to wipe out peonage, or any analogous condition, and it is to be wished that it could supplement rural credit measures with the offer of larger areas of homestead land than are available. The growing density of population in Porto Rico suggests that only the development of manufacturing can avert or soften many acute social problems. A full supply of labor is itself an incentive to the placing of capital in industrial enterprises, but insular witnesses at one of the sessions of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations proposed that the Government try more actively to encourage investments.

Pass the Jones bill, hinted ex-President Taft at San Francisco last week, and the Philippines will in no time be reduced to the state of Mexico; Governor-General Harrison has already carried them far towards ruin. In the face of such dark predictions, it is sufficient to ask for specific examples of ruination, and to recall how mild the provisions of the Jones measure actually are. Mr. Taft spoke of a "present pernicious lack of self-restraint and sacrifice of public weal to political pelf." Does this refer to such acts as the recent mass meeting of Cebu people to protest against the return of Dean C. Worcester as the head of the Visayan Refining Company? The Filipinos' dislike of opponents of their desire for greater self-government is too natural to convict them of political incapacity. This much abused Jones bill is but a logical sequel to the Administration's action of

1913 in giving the Filipinos a majority in both houses of the insular Assembly. It confers upon the Assembly full powers of legislation except as regards tariff, currency, and public lands, but still vests in the American Congress an absolute veto. The suffrage is also cautiously enlarged. Mr. Taft states that it will be two generations before the Filipinos are fully able to govern themselves. Opinions differ on this; but the Jones bill, as passed by the House last session, set no definite date for surrendering the islands.

The new Constitution of New York State goes before the people by a vote that commends it to their favorable consideration. Not only was it adopted in its final form on Friday by a vote of more than three-fourths of the delegates; the bulk of the opposition vote was due to Tammany's objection to a single provision, that relating to apportionment. The alignment of forces is thus the opposite from that which the agitators for a Convention confidently expected when they invited the people of the State to vote upon the question of holding one. Then the Democratic organization counted upon plumping enough votes to insure the returning of an affirmative answer, and hoped to elect a majority of the delegates to the Convention so ordered. In the first part of this plan, it was completely successful. Had it not been for the military-like response of the Tammany cohorts, the Convention proposal would have been defeated. As it was, the proposal was carried by the small majority of 3,000 in a total vote of 300,000. But in the second half of its programme, the Democratic organization failed. The Republicans elected a large majority of the delegates. Yet the division in the Convention has not been a division between Republicans and Democrats. Once more the Empire State has been treated to the spectacle of the notorious bi-partisan alliance, this time shamelessly out in the open. Its last appearance was somewhat ludicrous, Barnes joining on Friday with the twenty-eight Democrats who could not accept the apportionment article, and then finally changing his vote to the affirmative side.

Mistress in her own house, Canada is giving a lesson in housekeeping to her mother. Since the beginning of the war, according to announcement made by the Labor Department, there has been a complete cessation of strikes in the Dominion. The prolonged strike of the Vancouver coal miners was

formally called off ten days after hostilities began, and even chronic centres of discontent have been calm. In large measure this has been due to the appeal of the Government to employers and workers to make extraordinary efforts to adjust peaceably any difficulties. In part, it is to be ascribed to the prosperity the country has found in war-orders and in the relief recruiting brought to an overcrowded labor market. With steady and profitable production in many lines following a long period of depression, the country has been in no mood to sacrifice its gains wantonly. But it is a significant part of the manifestation of a new spirit in Canada, roused by the war to a long-needed stock-taking and heart-searching in both economic and political matters. The quarrels of party have been hushed in their incipency; the early scandals in the production of munitions caused an extraordinary outburst of indignation; such grafting as that which led last week to the indictment of the late Roblin Ministry in Manitoba faces a sterner public opinion; and it is natural that sentiment should be hostile to those responsible for labor troubles.

That extraordinary success in the largest affairs of practical enterprise is not incompatible with the keenest interest in a wide range of subjects having nothing to do with these was strikingly attested in the case of Sir William Van Horne, whose death removes the most striking figure in the business world of Canada. His personality was as interesting as his work, and there was a certain mark of genius in the amateur activities of various kinds in which he employed his leisure. It is a rather notable coincidence that, while the United States furnished Van Horne to Canada, Canada gave to the United States the man whose career and personality most suggest that of the chief maker of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a difference in that J. J. Hill came to Minnesota while a mere youth, and "grew up with the country," while Van Horne was forty, and had been president of a railway company, before he transferred his energies to the Canadian field. In another respect, however, the analogy is complete. Van Horne became as thoroughly devoted to Canada as Hill to the United States; and both men have been conspicuous in the general life of the respective countries.

The intemperate expression of international animosities by some European scholars has excited so much comment that it

is pleasant to note as a foil the continuance of various friendly studies in international fields. The only two periodicals devoted exclusively to research work in the English language and literature—the *Anglia* and the *Englische Studien*—are to be maintained by their German sponsors, and are to continue publishing articles by Englishmen, Germans, and Americans. The Hungarian *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* appeared last February without reference to the war, and the German *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* is also to be published. News comes from Berlin that the Berlin Academy is now engaged in bringing out an authorized dictionary of Old French, while Prof. Karl Vollmöller's periodical devoted to Romance philology will suffer no interruption. As for England, the Presidential address delivered by Prof. W. P. Ker before the London Philological Society last May dealt with Jacob Grimm, the founder of German philology, in the most generous manner. Professor Ker emphasized the fact that Grimm was, first and foremost, a human figure deserving affection and veneration; and he did full justice to his fundamental contributions to the scientific studies which he treated so broadly. In the field of the humanities, and among men schooled to the highest culture, there is no excuse for any other spirit than this.

The Germans, in reaching the railway from Vilna to Petrograd through Dvinsk, have broken a Russian line of communications which was of infinitely more importance six weeks ago than it is to-day. For this Petrograd-Vilna railway, prolonged to the southwest, becomes the Petrograd-Warsaw road which figured so prominently in the pre-Warsaw dispatches. Had this line been broken before the fall of the Polish capital on August 5, the German total of prisoners would have unquestionably been much greater than it has been. Since Warsaw the Germans have been cracking off piece after piece of the railway line, moving towards Petrograd—at first up to Bielowostok, and then up to Grodno. Now it seems probable that the section up to Dvinsk (Dünaburg) will go, and with it the great city of Vilna, the ancient capital of Lithuania. Against Vilna there will now be an encircling movement from south and north, and the evacuation spoken of for more than a month should soon be a fact. Dvinsk, on the other hand, should hold out for some time, since it can still draw reinforcements from the north.

THE LUSITANIA AND THE ARABIC.

The difficulty between this country and Germany on the subject of the latter's submarine policy suddenly became an international issue of the utmost gravity on May 7 through the sinking of the Lusitania. With almost equal suddenness the issue appeared to be removed as a possible source of serious trouble on September 1, through Count Bernstorff's note, brought out by the sinking of the Arabic. The burst of satisfaction, of hearty approval and congratulation for President Wilson, and of recognition for what Count Bernstorff and the Imperial Government appeared to have done, gave ample evidence of the good will of the American people and their readiness to accept at its best interpretation the brief assurance contained in the German Ambassador's note to Secretary Lansing. That is still unquestionably the disposition of the nation; but in the fortnight that has since passed there have been developments whose effect inevitably has been to emphasize the incompleteness of the assurance rather than the gratifying purpose of friendliness towards this country, and of a desire to satisfy its plain demands, to which alone the communication could be ascribed.

In the news of last week there were two items that are well calculated to fix attention on vital points that remain to be cleared up. One of them is a reminder of what happened at the beginning of the Lusitania trouble, the other is a fresh and highly troublesome contribution to the question of the Arabic. The commander of the submarine which sank the Arabic, so far from being, as had been thought, at the bottom of the sea himself, is very much alive, and has reported to the Admiralty that he torpedoed the Arabic in the belief that she was about to attack the submarine. Moreover, the German Government, in a note on the subject, has expressly signified its own satisfaction with this explanation. Without entering into the question of what degree of justification the commander may have had for his suspicion, it is obvious that if peaceful passengers and crews on merchant ships are to hold their lives at the mercy of what the commander of a German submarine may happen to think the ship is about to do, their safety hangs on a very slender thread. Exemption from the requirement of warning and visitation, if it can be obtained on these terms, is evidently so elastic that there is no telling, in any given instance, upon what new ground it may be claimed. In our first Lusitania

note there occurred this sentence: "Manifestly, submarines cannot be used against merchantmen, as the last few weeks have shown, without an inevitable violation of many sacred principles of justice and humanity." Later experience caused President Wilson to modify his view of this matter; but this latest phase of the Arabic affair must inevitably compel him once more to reconsider the question. He cannot content himself with a general assurance which in any particular instance may be reduced to nothing better than an empty form.

These considerations come to the mind with special force in connection with the other item of news to which we have referred. The man who shortly after the sinking of the Lusitania asserted under oath that he had seen guns mounted aboard her, has pleaded guilty to the charge of perjury. This disposes for good and all of the legend of the "armed Lusitania." That she was armed there has never been adduced a particle of evidence worthy of a moment's consideration; that she was not armed was attested in the most absolute manner by the regularly constituted authorities of the Port of New York. Yet the German Government in its reply to our first Lusitania note declared that "the Lusitania, according to information received here, had cannon aboard which were mounted and concealed below decks." Concerning the source of this "information," nothing whatever has been revealed by the German Government; nor is there the slightest reason to suppose that the appalling crime of May the seventh was in reality brought about by the existence of any real information of that kind. It should be remembered in this connection, moreover, that the warning advertisement inserted in American newspapers on behalf of Germany just before the sailing of the Lusitania made no sort of reference to any such ground for the contemplated act of murder. In view of all these things, it is impossible to rest complacently in the assurance that the German Government, still less the individual commanders of German submarines, will carry out in good faith all that was promised—and more than was at all clearly promised—in the few lines in which Count Bernstorff announced his country's new policy.

The delighted welcome that was given to that communication was due less to its exact words than to the spirit which seemed—and which we still believe was—behind the act. It is hardly conceivable that Germany could wish to place herself in the position of trifling with the solemn demands of this

country. That she might reject them was conceivable enough; that she should make a feint at granting them, only to show in a little while that she meant nothing of any value, we cannot believe. What is wanted now is that clear-cut and comprehensive understanding of which Count Bernstorff's note can be regarded only as a forerunner. What is wanted is neither more nor less than that which President Wilson set forth in the very first sentence of the first Lusitania note:

In view of recent acts of the German authorities in violation of American rights on the high seas, which culminated in the torpedoing and sinking of the British steamship Lusitania on May 7, 1915, by which over 100 American citizens lost their lives, it is clearly wise and desirable that the Government of the United States and the Imperial German Government should come to a *clear and full understanding* as to the grave situation which has resulted.

It is all very well patiently to thresh out the particulars of the Arabic case, patiently to investigate the facts regarding the Hesperian. But to fix attention upon these alone is not to see the forest for the trees. The immediate need of the moment is that "clear and full understanding as to the grave situation" which President Wilson set out to obtain on May 13, and which recent events, whatever be their explanation, show to be as essential for the safety and honor of the nation as it was four months ago.

DR. DUMBA'S DISMISSAL.

The country has acclaimed the President's action in asking for the withdrawal of the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, Dr. Dumba. From the moment when the *New York World* published the contents of the letter which that official entrusted to Mr. Archibald, no other outcome has been possible—provided that no legitimate explanation was forthcoming. There was none. On the contrary, Dr. Dumba sought to brazen it out on the theory that he was thereby saving from prison three hundred thousand of his "nationals" who would naturally desire to return to Austria-Hungary, and that it was his duty to protect those citizens of his country, even to the extent of getting them out by means of strikes, the real purpose of which the Austro-Hungarian beneficiaries might never even know. But the fatal sentence in his letter as to the German military attaché's belief that these strikes would disorganize the munitions industry at Bethlehem and in the Middle West, so clearly showed that self-interest was mixed up with the benevolent purpose as to leave him in a hopeless predicament. And so, despite the

friendliness of the American Government for Austria-Hungary, as clearly evidenced by the admirably worded note forwarded by the State Department, Dr. Dumba is properly compelled to go. In all probability his career is at an end.

His downfall is plainly due to a total misconception of what are a diplomat's proper functions when stationed in a neutral country in time of war. The circumstances have, we admit, been particularly trying. It is a good deal, we suppose, to expect diplomats to sit quietly by while they see everything going against them, first the current of popular opinion, and next, because of the British control of the sea, a steady flow of supplies and ammunition to their enemies. But that was the fortune of war; it was precisely that which Germany and Austria risked when they took up the sword, and it was not the duty or the right of any diplomat to try to offset it by underhand means. For that was to make a battleground of the United States and to assume functions no longer diplomatic, but distinctly belligerent. Only on the assumption that diplomacy is a word which covers every kind of chicanery, every kind of interference with the legitimate domestic affairs of a nation, can Dr. Dumba's course be justified. One has merely to imagine, if one can, what would happen to an American diplomat who should seek to start a strike in the Krupp works for the benefit of his country, to see how scandalous Dr. Dumba's plan was.

Nor is the situation affected by the fact that the 300,000 Austro-Hungarians for whom he sought to act are still subjects of his Kaiser. If they were in danger of forever cutting themselves off from returning to Europe because of ignorantly taking service in munitions establishments; if they, as Dr. Dumba alleges, are miserable "white slaves" working "twelve hours a day," then the proper remedy was not to buy up venal labor-leaders, but to present the case openly and above board. This Government would unquestionably have advised him how best to warn his fellow-citizens, and if it is true that men are being driven to work twelve hours a day for seven days a week, the proper appeal lay to our Department of Labor and to the American conscience. The whole difficulty would have been avoided if this course had been followed. That it was not shows both how naturally some diplomats resort to subterranean methods and how ignorant Dr. Dumba, for all his astuteness, was of the spirit of the American people.

Surely he should have learned from the daily press how deeply stirred our public is by the constant publication of stories that foreign diplomats have been interfering in our domestic concerns. His duty—the purpose for which he as a diplomat was accredited to this country—was to keep the peace between the two nations, and not to recommend to his Government a policy which was bound to alienate them if the slightest proof of it were to come to light. Certainly, Dr. Dumba cannot have been aware that a British Ambassador was sent home merely for advising an American citizen how to vote. He cannot have realized the high spirit of the American people, how sure is their sense of justice, how quick they would be to resent what they considered an unpardonable wrong; and he cannot have understood the positive wickedness of the proposal made to him which he so promptly made his own. The man who fomented labor troubles for ulterior purposes, be he capitalist, or foreigner, or venal labor-leader, is a public enemy.

We trust that Dr. Dumba's fate will prove a warning to others. Nine-tenths of the stories published about the activities of the German Embassy we assume to be untrue, partly because they are themselves so unsupported, and partly because if they were true our State Department must long ago have acted as vigorously as now. But the sole function of military and naval attachés is to report to their Government military and naval conditions in this country, and we fear that Capt. von Papen and Capt. Boy-Ed have construed their duties here in entirely to liberal a spirit.

CHANGE IN RUSSIA?

The assumption by the Czar of the chief command of the Russian armies is much more significant as a symbol than as a fact. It is plain recognition of the serious situation which confronts the Empire, and of the need of rallying the nation's energies to a supreme effort. For his part, the Czar, by placing himself at the head of the armies, is trying to bring into play whatever magic still attaches to the person of the autocrat among the vast peasant population of Russia. But brute mass alone will not suffice. The will and the energies of the intelligent classes must be brought into action; and that is why, simultaneously with the replacement of the Grand Duke Nicholas as commander-in-chief, comes the replacement of the Conservative majority in the Duma by a Liberal-Progressive coa-

lition. For some time there has been talk of the organization of a Ministry of all parties, similar to that which arose in France during the first weeks of the war and subsequently in Great Britain. Some such "sacred union" is the natural outcome of defeat in the field. But in Russia, as we have it to-day, there is not to be union of parties, but a replacement of parties. The Conservative element which has been in control has not merely been found wanting, it has been found inimical to success. Once more Russia has learned that reactionary ideals are unfit to survive in the modern competition of great nations.

It is three weeks more than ten years since the disasters in Manchuria, by stirring up a nation-wide demand for change, elicited the Imperial rescript of August 19, 1905, in which the convocation of a national Duma or Parliament was promised. It is three weeks less than ten years since the representatives to the congress of Zemstvos declared at Moscow that the nation would not be satisfied with the shadowy Parliament promised in the Czar's proclamation. So now the news comes from Petrograd that the Liberal elements in the Duma will not be content with a perfunctory recognition of their numerical strength, but that a thorough reversal of policy must come if the nation is to rally with all its will to the hard necessities of the moment. That the expected change is to take the form, not of a reconciliation of all parties, but of the installation of the Liberal parties in power is the demand virtually formulated by Millukoff, the veteran leader of the Constitutional Democratic party. The Conservatives are accused of working for a dissolution of the Duma. Millukoff answers with the threat of revolution. "I believe you understand clearly that in these circumstances a dismissal would be political madness. Let those who are agitating it know, therefore, that if the Duma is prorogued now, we shall meet again in a few weeks, perhaps in a different frame of mind. Let the Duma go on calmly and quietly with its work."

In the programme put forth by the new coalition in the Duma it is made plain that we are not dealing with the overthrow of a parliamentary majority on the ground that it has proved inefficient in a specific task. It is not a question of putting in a Ministry which shall conduct the war more ably than its predecessors. It is a question of putting a new spirit and a new outlook into the Government. What could be done in the way of replacing war ministers, army

commanders, and even commanders-in-chief, in organizing munitions boards and defence councils, has been done. Much bigger changes are put forward by the new Liberal majority: autonomy for Poland, conciliation for Finland, justice for the Jews, amnesty for political prisoners, liberty for the trade unions. It is a reassertion of hopes and demands that flourished during the first flush of victory over the autocracy in 1905, and have since been frustrated. Though these demands are political in nature, they tie themselves up closely with the fortunes of war. It is characteristic of a Bourbonism which never learns, that while Russia was engaged in a war calling for her united energies, the repression in Finland should have been continued with increasing rigor; that the laws of exception against the Jews should have been brutally enforced at the very moment that hundreds of thousands of Jewish soldiers were facing the enemy on the frontier; and that now, in a moment of high crisis, the reactionaries should be plotting for a dissolution of the Duma, when every sign points to revolution as the result.

Defeat, followed by the menace of revolution, is the only way in which the powers of reaction in Russia can ever be taught; and even then the lesson is soon forgotten. For the moment, however, it appears that the ruling powers at Petrograd have recognized, what has been evident to the enlightened elements in Russia, that the reactionaries and the bureaucrats have not only brought defeat upon the nation in battle, but undermined Russia's moral position before the world. More than once we have referred to the handicap under which the western Allies labor in their association with a Government that stands for political, racial, religious, and social repression. In this country pro-German sentiment is to a very great extent anti-Russian sentiment. We have the alien populations who have felt directly the sting of Russian oppression, and there is a goodly section of native American opinion which finds it hard to sympathize with the ideals of Russian government. Berlin has recognized its advantage in this respect. It has promised a free national life to the Poles, it has espoused the cause of the Jews, it has lost no opportunity to emphasize its contention of the early days of the war, that it was primarily a war of defence against Slav barbarism. Petrograd could afford to disregard moral issues while its armies were pressing victoriously through the Carpathians. With the enemy driving into the

heart of the Empire, the bitter post-bellum lessons of 1854, of 1878, and of 1905 stare her in the face.

THE QUESTION OF A LOAN TO EUROPE.

With the arrival of the commission of eminent London and Paris financiers, representing their respective Governments and banks in conferences on the foreign exchange situation, the question of a large loan, to be made by our markets to those of Europe, has come definitely to the front. The machinery of international exchange is so technical and intricate that the man in the street is hardly to blame for being perplexed as to just what the controversy means. Yet the questions at issue, in the conference between the European commission and our own bankers, are at bottom simple enough.

The first source of perplexity to many readers of the news is the question, why abnormal rates of exchange on London and Paris could be corrected by a \$500,000,000 loan, raised by those markets in America. The answer is that the raising of such a loan would enable the English and French Governments to draw on the proceeds, when making payment for their purchases of American materials and supplies. By this expedient, the abnormally large amount of drafts on London for such payments would be to that extent reduced. The problem is not of England's inability to obtain the necessary money from loans raised in Europe; that idea involves a total misconception of the position of affairs. But an American manufacturer, drawing on London against merchandise shipments of any sort, sells his draft to a banker for collection, and the sum total of such drafts has become so enormous, under present conditions in the "war-order" market, that the rate of exchange allowed for them in American money by the New York banker has lately depreciated $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. from the normal parity of exchange.

Such a condition is bound to hurt both the European and the American markets. English importers of American goods who have contracted to settle the bill in dollars at New York (which is the case with most of the "war orders") have to pay 5 or 6 per cent. extra, in order to command the requisite American money through a draft on a London bank. But American exporters to whom payment is made in pounds sterling (as is the case with our great staple markets) must equally submit to a 5 or 6 per cent. deduction from the proceeds of the sale,

in order to turn them into American money.

Neither market wishes that state of things to continue. Conceivably, enough more gold might be sent from Europe to restore equilibrium. But London and Paris need what gold they have to protect the soundness of their paper currencies; whereas our own banks and Government already possess more gold than ever before in their history. There would always remain the much-talked-of expedient of the English and French investors selling outright, to our own markets, the one or two thousand millions of American securities still held by them. But, waiving the question whether the individual owners of these stocks and bonds are desirous of selling, the prospect of such enormous pressure on our investment markets, with its presumable effect on prices at the Stock Exchange, is much disliked in American financial circles. The compromise plan, for a loan of \$500,000,000 or more, appears to contemplate, in addition to the European Governments' guarantee, the pledge of these very securities as collateral. This, if effected, would obviously avert the predicted overwhelming liquidation; American securities thus "tied up" could not be sold until the loan had expired.

We shall not at present attempt to discuss the arrangements as to term of the loan, rate of interest, and so on—practical considerations which must engage the minds of the conferring bankers. It would presumably have to be made payable, interest and principal, in American dollars, and it would certainly have to be free of the income tax, which the British Government—wrongfully and unwisely, we have always believed—has heretofore been accustomed to deduct from interest payments on its bonds, even when made to foreign holders. Probably, any such loan would be made to run for something like five years, and it would presumably be issued in a form admitting of its distribution among private investors. Even the sum total of the loan is still in question; the amount proposed may conceivably exceed the commonly named figure of \$500,000,000.

Two other questions remain, however, which have more or less puzzled the public mind. First, will our people be able to buy so enormous a single issue of new securities? Secondly, does not the making of such a loan to belligerent Powers depart from the rule of strict neutrality originally set forth by President Wilson? As to the first question, the abnormal plethora of money in the banking institutions of this country renders un-

derwriting even of so great a loan an easy possibility, and, as for private investors, one notable result of the war to date, with the attendant conditions in home trade, has been the immense decrease in supply of new investment securities offered on our markets.

The objection of neutrality hardly fits the case. The loan, in the first place, would be raised solely to pay for purchase of merchandise in America, and the propriety of that sort of operation has already been recognized, as in the smaller government loan placed here by France. But apart from this consideration, a very noteworthy precedent, all things considered, was the offering and public advertising, last spring, of something like \$10,000,000 German Government notes through American banking houses, and their sale to investors in this country.

EASY THINKERS ON HARD QUESTIONS.

Within the past few weeks the chairman of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations has given expression in several public utterances to his views on some of the largest aspects of the economic organization of modern society. These views are bold, radical, and far-reaching, yet remarkably little attention seems to have been paid to them, and no attention at all of that sort which might naturally be supposed to go with his official position. In some degree this indifference to the lucubrations of Mr. Walsh may be accounted for by the intense absorption of the public not only in the great war, but more especially in the developments affecting the possible implication of our own country in the gigantic conflict. But this explanation is by no means adequate. We are not so absorbed in the issues of the war, tremendous as they are, as to preclude our taking a genuine interest in any genuine contribution to the discussion of vital questions of public welfare. The difficulty with Mr. Walsh is that his conduct during the period in which the Commission was conducting its operations made it plain that he was not the kind of man from whom any valuable contribution to the understanding of the subject could be expected. By this we do not mean that his opinions were sure to be wrong; we mean both more and less than this. His opinions were not sure to be wrong, but they were sure, even if they were right, to be merely his opinions and not the result either of competent thinking or of sober and careful marshaling of facts.

When, for example, Mr. Walsh tells us that it would be a good thing for the nation to take possession of the whole, or the greater part, of all large fortunes upon the deaths of their possessors and use the proceeds for purposes of social betterment, what occasion is there for analyzing the merits of this proposal, or for putting forward the objections to it, any more than there was on the day before? There is nothing novel in the idea itself, nor is there anything remarkable in what he says about it. All that has been added to the world's knowledge on the subject is the fact that a certain Frank P. Walsh, who happened to have been named by the President as chairman of what ought to have been an important investigating commission, and who had thoroughly shown his unfitness for the post, thinks thus and so on the subject of the taxation or confiscation of great fortunes. Nor is the case very different when he assures us that the causes of labor unrest are to be found in low wages, unfair practices on the part of employers, etc. What he says about these things may be entirely true. It is even very possible that with all his blundering and hectoring he succeeded, in the sessions of the Commission, in bringing out some facts of serious importance that were previously unknown or insufficiently known. But his discussion of them, and the presentation of his own conclusions on the great questions which they affect, are of infinitesimal value. Men incomparably better fitted than he to discuss all these subjects, whether from the radical or the conservative standpoint, have been writing abundantly about them for many years; and such authority as his utterances might have been supposed to derive from his connection with the work of the Commission is wholly absent.

In quite a different category, and yet offering occasion for somewhat similar reflections, are the outgivings of many excellent persons, especially clergymen, who undertake in an offhand way to tell us what is the matter with the world and how it is to be mended. In a different category, because from them there is no reason to expect anything but broad general views, prompted by humane aspirations and ordinary intelligence and insight. When a minister of religion discusses questions of economic evil, he is not expected to base his remarks on special knowledge or on expert inquiry; and no fault can be found with him on the score of his confining himself to broad indica-

tions of the direction in which improvement should be striven for. It is not enlightenment as to facts, or guidance in the unravelling of complexities, that he is supposed to supply; if he stimulates in his hearers right-mindedness and humanity, he does a worthy work. But if, coming down to particulars, and pronouncing judgment on specific economic and social questions, he treats with a shallow and easy-going sentimentalism the tough problems which men quite as conscientious as he, and infinitely better equipped, find it necessary to grapple with the utmost care and caution, the fact that his intentions are good is but little mitigation of his offence.

The Labor Day sermon is very apt to present examples of this kind of darkening of counsel. A typical case is this, from the report of a sermon delivered in New York:

The laboring man deserves more of this world's goods. It is not right for a producer to have to walk and watch the rich man, who does not work, ride by in an automobile. It grates on him. As long as we have the present system of relations of capital and labor, we will have the rabid Socialists and the I. W. W. I plead with you to do everything possible to bring about a better understanding between capital and labor.

The most ignorant man in the good preacher's audience could hardly entertain cruder or more futile notions of the problems of society than are indicated in this brief passage. The question that confronts the world is not whether it "grates on" the poor man that walks to see the rich man ride, but whether there is any way of altering the fundamental constitution of society so as to bring about a state of things on the whole better than that which we now possess. To declare that the capitalist is little better than a robber because he has an automobile while his employees have none, is hardly a hopeful way of bringing about "a better understanding between capital and labor." What the worthy gentleman thinks the "rabid Socialists" are after that goes beyond what he seems to be after, we are somewhat puzzled to conjecture. But the truth is, no doubt, that he doesn't know what he is after himself; all that he knows is that things are not as his humanitarian instincts tell him they ought to be. But, so far from tending to bring about such approximation to his ideals as may be practically attainable, the thoughtless stirring up of mere unintelligent discontent is calculated only to increase ill-feeling, and thus to aggravate evils without pointing the way towards any remedy.

Foreign Correspondence

WHAT THEY SAY IN PARIS.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, August 28.

It is a pity that American representatives of peace and casual Americans curiously spying out the land for publication should, on arriving in Paris, be able to learn only what they are allowed to see and hear while being personally conducted by chance American residents who are themselves veriest "outsiders" to native French ideas and feelings and sympathies; and, whenever they are handed over to Frenchmen, to find only prehistoric pacifists or those denaturalized by cosmopolitanism or Socialist politicians who have not forgotten the dreams of the Internationale that failed with the outbreak of war. They must expect criticism like the following:

"The women who went to the recent Congress of The Hague have not shown very remarkable wisdom or equity. They acknowledged that 'War is of itself the negation of right,' and so 'they abstained from discussing eventual regulation of it.' In other words, under color of a lofty and unbending adherence to principle, they have excused German atrocities as normal consequences of war. Moreover, these *Congressistes* have undertaken a campaign for immediate peace, that is—always under pretext of, their doctrine—for the peace desired by Germany and Austria-Hungary! Frankly, such a demonstration of international feminism will not increase its credit greatly with clear-seeing, right-minded persons. And French women who refused invitations to such a congress were quite right" (leader page of *Paris Temps*, August 25).

Those who have been talking so much of late years about "collective souls" might well apply their theories to the one mind of the French people at present. They, too, are tired of war; and, unlike neutral advocates of immediate peace, they have suffered all that one country can suffer from another in war. But they have no intention to suffer what the enemy calls "honorable peace." Then, indeed, all the bloodshed and misery were in vain and the Terror of the German name would still hang over their children.

In the Stuttgart review *Jung Deutschland* Marshal von der Goltz has just published a letter which intemperate Americans might well puzzle over:

"It is a psychological enigma that Germany should have heaped up such hatred against herself." The Marshal commanded in Belgium in the first bitter days of conquest. And Henry James said that Miss Miranda, of Bangor, Maine, doing Europe alone before proceeding to Boston for "culture," all unconsciously skirted abysses!

Parisians, during the first half of August, were more concerned with American buyers of Paris fashions than with American colporteurs of peace. That, at least, might help French men and women to earn a living. On the part of Parisiennes, there is little effort at fashion. There is brightness in the streets, there is elegance even when worn and faded. But there is the recurring reminder—a one-legged soldier on crutches, a woman and girl black-veiled, the eager-faced crowd at a bul-

letin board—that war is on and must be fought to the end.

"Switzerland has ordered 180,000 new uniforms—they must be for next winter." "My concierge says a soldier told him that General G. assures his men there will be no winter campaign." "What sign is there of the war ending?" "The English are coming with men—and with guns." "It is high time."

Parisian pessimism does not go much further than this wandering talk. There are plenty among the men who criticize this general and ask why that military move was not made, as Uncle Toby and Tristram Shandy did. There are women who have heard their men talk or have gleaned in the papers and ask timidly: "Will Rumania come in soon?" And every one has confidence in what some call Providence and others the unexpected which happens in time.

It is no longer a secret that the hope of final victory is based on guns and ammunition. Every one has heard that the Russians were forced to retreat because they were wanting in guns and ammunition; and the Allied armies along the French line will not attack for good until they have a million shells a day to rain on the enemy. Popular formulas are simple, but that is no reason why they should not be true.

Every one is interested in this manufacture of arms and shells, which is going on wherever a factory can be set up. In my house two refugee boys from the invaded region were in great misery with their sister, a soldier's widow with two babes; and they are now earning almost the support of all of them in some one of these war mills. The whole neighborhood takes interest and passes the word about whenever one or other is "advanced."

There is something, after all, in the scientific flub-dub about the French being gregarious. They talk, and they talk with each other from top to bottom of the social tree—and, as in the kinetic theory of gases, there comes to be an equilibrium of idea-molecules, an average state of feeling, the collective soul. This explains—partly—the great Revolution and the Commune. Happily, this time it has been an equilibrium of patience and order in national defence.

It is another delusion of foreigners that this even resolution depends on the French people being kept uninformed. Now the entire speech in self-defence of the German Chancellor was printed literally and completely in all the Paris newspapers, even those for workmen, the day after it was uttered in the Reichstag. So were the main parts of the German Finance Minister's speech to prove his own country solvent and all her enemies bankrupt. As I have often noted, Swiss papers with German political *communiqués* and the wonderful Wolff dispatches are sold by the hundreds in every quarter. From comparison with American newspapers, in which every one must blaze a way for himself among contradictory cablegrams, I do not think the common people of Paris are less well informed about the real state of things than intelligent people in the United States.

Even the plan for a secret session of Parliament, in which Government and politicians can have it out together, has impressed the people little. They believe that the substance of the secrets to be given out for judgment by Parliament is, after all, only what they call a Punch-and-Judy secret already told. For members of Parliament, of course, there is the desire to keep up to their traditions of

Parliamentary predominance. Doubtless, too, there is some underhand politics—such as is not unknown in our own Congress. The people only ask: "When are the English going to begin?" and "When is Gen. Joffre going to make a move?" and "What of the Dardanelles?" The dogs bark, the caravan passes.

I have been very much struck by the hesitation of Parisians in bearing judgment on the American attitude. This is perhaps due in great part to their newspapers; but it is a curious fact. They ask: "Are you going to declare war?" "Is President Wilson a strong man?" (this is very frequent). "Would it not be better for us that you should go on as you are and sell us arms and ammunition and provisions?"

Ever since the neutral nations kept silence when the neutrality of Belgium was violated, the French people have been unsure as to principles and actions of neutrals in general. For America the accepted explanation is: "You have so many German-Americans!" I think, however, it is generally recognized that a country may base its neutrality on the observance of strict legality towards itself alone.

AN INTENSE WEEK—APPRECIATION OF THE PROBLEMS TO BE MET BY "THE LONELY MAN" IN THE WHITE HOUSE—CONSCRIPTION.

By T. L. GILMOUR.

LONDON, August 24.

The publication yesterday of the cables announcing the serious naval reverse suffered by the German fleet in the Gulf of Riga came as a welcome break in the monotonous record of bad news of the past week. There is no virtue in disguising obvious facts. Since I wrote last, the Allies have had a black week. Curiously enough, it is not the things that have happened nearest to us geographically that have made the greatest impression. The revived activity of Germany's Zeppelin fleet has had singularly little effect on the public mind. While the German papers are declaring that it is not so much the material damage done which justified the raids as the effect they produce on the morale of the British people, the simple fact is that the German psychologist is once more wrong in his *a priori* reasoning, and that as instruments for German "frightfulness" the vaunted Zeppelins are a failure. There is not, indeed, very much food for the popular imagination to work on. The information which the Government permits to be made public is of the scantiest. Primarily designed to deprive the enemy of the means of correcting and supplementing the information collected by his observers, this policy of restricting the information published to the barest indication of the locality of the raid, and to a statement of the number of persons killed and wounded, has the effect of depriving the newspapers of any opportunity of working up a press sensation. In London not only is the number of people who have actually seen a Zeppelin incredibly small—which is easily understood in view of the fact that these unwelcome visitors naturally select the night time for their calls upon us—but there are millions of Londoners who have never heard the firing of an anti-aircraft gun.

In short, the Zeppelin, so far, has been as

great a failure as a nerve destroyer as it has been as a military weapon. There is, however, a general conviction that we have not yet by any means experienced the maximum effort of Germany in the air. That is the only medium through which the Germans can "get at" us at all at present. Calais and the long-range guns which are to show the Kentish yeomen what Krupp can do are a long way off, and the occasional sniping of a fishing village by a submarine indicates nothing but a display of temper and how all-embracing is the German disregard for international law. A combined attack of airships and aeroplanes in force is, however, within the bounds of possibility, and while the prospect does not disconcert the public mind, our aviators ask nothing better than that the attempt may be made.

But the events which have undoubtedly very strikingly impressed the public imagination have been the dramatic successes of the German armies against our Russian allies, and the sinking of the Arabic. Of this last tragic happening, I prefer to say very little, partly because from the angle of vision from which we here regard this sinking of a passenger steamer without warning there is nothing that can be said which will add anything to what is already sufficiently known as to our attitude, but mainly because it is so obvious that the issues raised by the torpedoing of the Arabic are of infinitely greater urgency to the American Government and people than to us. Comment which tarries so long on the way, as must necessarily be the case with anything I might say, runs the serious risk of being overtaken by events, so I will merely record the fact that the extracts cabled to us from the American press have been read here with sympathy and appreciation, adding, however, that it is to that lonely figure in the White House that our thoughts have naturally most often turned during these recent days. It would be futile to pretend that no opinions have been formed or expressed as to what America should or should not do in the grave situation which has arisen, or to pretend that there is any stereotyped opinion upon this subject which can be labelled "British." There is no such opinion. But what may, I think, be said with truth is that there is to-day a clearer understanding on this side of the Atlantic than at any time since the beginning of the war of the immense complexity of the problem for which President Wilson has to find a solution. Mr. Tumulty's grave words at Springlake are everywhere accepted as indicating that the situation has reached the extreme of seriousness.

If I were asked to find a single word which would describe the popular feeling during the past week, I should be inclined to select "intense." The Zeppelin raids, the torpedoing of the Arabic, the sudden outburst of naval activity in the Baltic and the North Sea, and the firing by German torpedo boats on the British submarine which was helplessly stranded on the neutral coast of Denmark, the curious reticence of the official reports of the landing of a second British army at Suvla Bay, as compared with the unofficial story of what appears to have been one of the most brilliant exploits of the war, the indications that the smouldering controversy over the merits of the voluntary system as compared with compulsory service is being deliberately fanned into flame by a powerful group of newspapers, the declaration

by Italy of a state of war with Turkey—these and other scarcely less important events have so crowded the canvas upon a lurid background of the eastern battle front that men's minds have grown tense under the cumulative strain of what they read. The rapidity with which the German armies in the east have captured the great Russian fortresses and have forced the Grand Duke to contemplate, at least, an immediate withdrawal from the new line of defence which he had prepared, has unquestionably impressed the popular imagination, without, however, in any way weakening the determination to "see the thing through" or the confidence in the ultimate success of the Allies.

A great City banker confessed to me the other day that we had underestimated the economic resources of Germany in time of war; but he added that so long as the Allies were firm in their determination not to be beaten, they could not be beaten. That determination was never stronger in this country than it is to-day; it is equally strong in France. What then of Russia? It is quite evident that Germany is raining blows on her gigantic eastern neighbor in the hope, if not in the belief, that Russia, despite the engagement that she has entered into with her allies, may be forced to cry "Hold! enough." Once more German psychology is, I believe, entirely at fault. Russia's attitude is that of Henley:

My head is bloody, but unbowed.

A friend who has just returned from Petrograd tells me that he did not meet a single Russian who was prepared to admit that Poland would remain permanently in the possession of the Germans, or who did not believe that Galicia would be reoccupied before the conclusion of peace. Events may quite well prove any particular forecast of this kind to be erroneous, but the value of such statements does not lie so much in the intrinsic importance to be attached to them as in the light they throw on the spirit of the people. In no country is the detestation—it is impossible to use a milder expression—of the German spirit more intense than in Russia, and even if there should be in the ranks of the court party or the higher bureaucracy certain individuals who foresee in the defeat of Germany a menace to the continuance of their own power, it is certain that they are helpless to force upon the nation a disgraceful peace involving the recognition of German overlordship in the Russian Empire.

Meanwhile, in this country the successes which Germany has obtained on the eastern front have been vigorously exploited for all they are worth by that very voluble section of the community which sees in the adoption of universal compulsory service the only salvation, not merely for England, but for Europe. It is impossible to do more this week than to state the position in the most general terms and to utter a single word of warning. We are asked to believe that this country is doing less than our fair share in the general effort to defeat the Central Powers and their Turkish ally, that both France and Russia are keenly alive to our shortcomings, whatever Italy may think, and that the only way in which we can hearten our allies and strike terror into the hearts of our enemies is by compelling every man to serve the country as and when and where he may be directed to serve by "the Government." Obviously there is much to be said on each of these statements before any of them can be accepted as fairly representing the facts. But any

examination of this kind must be reserved for a future occasion. To-day it must be sufficient to say by way of warning to those observers at a distance who may find it difficult to appraise the values in a controversy of this kind, that they will do well not to lend too ready an ear either to those extremists who have argued themselves into the conviction not only that we cannot, but that we ought not to win the war without compulsion, or to those other extremists who are prepared to risk the loss of victory rather than to yield one iota of that personal liberty which is admittedly among the most cherished of our possessions. The great bulk of the people is in neither camp. The country does not want conscription; but will accept it if the responsible Government tells us that its acceptance is necessary to the winning of the war. But it must be the responsible Government that tells us.

Notes from the Capital

AN INDIANA PRODIGY.

The latest prominent American to investigate the European war on the spot and come back to tell us all about it, is Albert Jeremiah Beveridge, of Indiana. This is not the first time he has given such rein to his journalistic instinct. Before the ink was fairly dry on the treaty of peace with Spain, and before half the people of the United States could find the Philippines on the map, Beveridge saw his opportunity. He had just been elected to the Senate, and felt sure of a large audience when he should exploit his discoveries in a speech to that body, for it would be printed in the next day's *Record* and be spread broadcast over the country under franked wrappers. So he hastened to the archipelago, looked it over with the eye of a connoisseur in Oriental islands, and prepared an oration covering the whole annexation movement.

A stated address to the Senate from a newly enrolled member was substantially without precedent, but Beveridge had always revelled in doing unprecedented things. It was one of these—his bold demand, as a boy orator destitute of lawmaking experience, that the Legislature of Indiana send him to Washington—which had startled the time-tried Hoosier politicians into putting him where he now was; and he could see no reason why his present defiance of Senatorial etiquette and tradition should not operate as a good advertisement. It did. The leading newspapers reported his speech at great length, from printed slips he had already distributed. Nearly all noticed it editorially, either to criticise or to commend, and for fame-making purposes he didn't care which attitude they took. Only one of his fellow-Senators undertook to answer it seriously, though two or three others poked fun at it. Praise, blame, or satire—everything was grist for his mill; and within a week this small, lithe, beardless youngster could fairly claim to be the most widely talked-about man in America.

Next he went abroad and took a look at Russia when she was getting ready for her war with Japan, and on his return published "The Russian Advance," which convinced thousands of Americans that the Japanese had not the ghost of a chance in the impending

ing struggle. Now he is once more preparing the public mind for mighty events in the Old World, lest otherwise they might come upon our generation unheralded.

Like Bryan, Beveridge has been an orator from boyhood. While he was following the plough on an Illinois farm his fondness for coining resonant periods found an outlet through his commands to the draft-animals who were his only audience. When he passed from the farm to the logging-camp, his "bunkies" lent respectful ear to his eloquence; and graduating thence into a country college, he lost no time in announcing himself a candidate for a part in all the oratorical contests which came that way. In one of these he happened to have Bryan for an antagonist, and defeated him; and in 1896, when the news went forth from Chicago that Bryan had with a single speech hoisted himself from an inconspicuous delegate's place to the head of the Democratic national ticket, Beveridge's significant comment was: "I beat Bryan before, but he has been nominated for President first." Learning that Senator James K. Jones had been the person chiefly responsible for Bryan's opportunity to address the Convention, he put himself as often as possible in the way of seeing and talking with the Arkansan, in quest of valuable points. After his Philippine speech he walked over to the Democratic side of the Senate, engaged Jones in a friendly chat about commonplaces, and then plump—the question that filled his mind:

"Now, Senator, won't you tell me frankly, in the light of your long experience, how you liked my speech?"

"Well," answered the veteran, smiling thoughtfully as he stroked his beard, "since you are bound to have my candid opinion, I should think that if your ideas should some day catch up with your vocabulary, you might cut a pretty good figure as an orator!"

In his law practice, Beveridge's strongest hold is with a jury. His resourcefulness in extemporized dramatic effects is among his most notable qualities. One day a young and pretty schoolma'am retained him to defend her against a charge of having cruelly flogged a refractory pupil. At the trial, Beveridge manifested much concern when the opposing lawyer put the boy upon the stand, made him tell his story of the dreadful way in which the teacher had rained blows upon him with a tree-branch, and by way of proof bare his back so that the jury could see the marks of the punishment. As soon as Beveridge looked at these, his face brightened, and an expression of disdain took the place of his expression of apprehension. "Pshaw!" he exclaimed, "is that all? Here"—handing an attendant his pocket-knife—"go out and cut me a thin switch from the nearest tree."

Taking the switch lightly between the thumb and first two fingers of his right hand, he gave his legs a contemptuous half-dozen flecks, and then rolled up his trousers. His calves showed six welts, as thick and as discolored as those on the boy's back, though it was obvious that he could not have been hurt badly. His bland smile as he stepped back met an instant response on the faces of the jury, and the teacher went her way rejoicing. Every one who had witnessed the demonstration was so overcome by it that even the opposing lawyer did not recover his wits enough till after dinner to ejaculate: "By Jove! I wonder whether Bev could have put those welts on his legs before he came into court!"

VEILLARD.

Automatic Government

OUR EXHILARATING QUEST FOR A POLITICAL MECHANISM THAT WILL TURN OUT A GOOD LAW AT THE TOUCH OF A BUTTON.

By ROYAL J. DAVIS.

It is now three years since the brief but somewhat sensational announcement: "Arizona now leads all American States in forms of self-government." This triumph had been attained within the space of forty-eight momentous hours. On the 16th of May, 1912, the Legislature—the first in the history of the new Commonwealth—passed laws providing for the "advisory recall" of United States Senators, and the "advisory nomination" and "advisory recall" of Federal District Judges. On the 17th, the bills were signed by the Governor. It was in reality a double triumph. President Taft had vetoed the first draft of a Constitution submitted to him by Congress, because it contained a provision for the recall of judges. In consequence, it had been necessary for Congress to pass a second draft, with the offending article omitted. Gov. Hunt, in his first message to the first Legislature of the new State, urged the passing of a Constitutional amendment restoring the article. The legislators, being, as a friendly critic noted at the time, "singularly independent and free in their activities," acceded to the request, and the amendment was ratified by the people in November. The triumph over an unprogressive President was complete, but of itself would not have given Arizona the dizzy distinction of leading all American States in forms of self-government. This exalted position was due to the fact that the "advisory nomination" and "advisory recall" provisions were but the completion of a structure that had been well begun by the "Constitutional initiative," the "direct statutory initiative," and the "referendum."

I.

If Arizona had thus expressed formally her distrust of her Legislature, the only difference in this respect between her and some of her sister States was that she was forehanded enough to put herself on guard against it previous to its initial appearance upon the scene. Prevention in order to avoid the necessity for cure was evidently her motto.

This distrust of Legislatures is a recent development, at least in the proportions it has assumed. Our fathers, and especially our grandfathers, were more inclined to distrust the Executive, looking to the Legislative to save them from the encroachments of the more arbitrary authority. In our day the Executive makes no bones of denouncing the Legislative for its unresponsiveness to the popular will. We expect a new Governor to make himself solid with us by telling us that the men whom we elected at the same time that we elected him, and for the purpose of working with him, are a poor

lot, whose powers or numbers should be reduced, while his own influence over government should be augmented. A Governor of Kansas suggests a small Legislature of one house, chosen for four or six years—double, that is, the period for which legislators are ordinarily elected—and with the Governor as a member. A Governor of Washington also recommends a small unicameral Legislature of twenty-five members. Oregon voted last November to retain her Senate, but a full third of those voting upon the question favored abolition. Even the Governor of Arizona, whose Legislature apparently started out so well, advises a one-house body of from five to fifteen members. But Oklahoma has come nearest the goal. Had it not been for the requirement in her Constitution that an amendment must receive a majority, not simply of the votes cast upon it, but of the total vote cast at that election, she would be trying the experiment of a one-house Legislature of eighty members, empowered to choose, in their turn, a commission of fifteen. The vote for this amendment was 95,000, to 72,000 against it.

The indictment of our law-making assemblies has two counts: it charges them with betrayal of the public, and with stupidity. Either, if proved, is enough to condemn, if we can supply the place of the condemned. The first charge used to be more loudly made than the second, but this order has been reversed. One hears less of the venality of our law-makers just now than of their stupidity. Stupid they must often be admitted to be, with a stupidity ranging from mere obtuseness—a negative defect—to absurdity and fanaticism. There is nobody like a Governor for holding them up to scorn for this weakness, and, among Governors, Hodges, of Kansas, has furnished the most picturesque bill of particulars. He and his Attorney-General did their best to scrutinize the flood of bills that poured through the legislative mill-race, but in spite of their care they discovered, at the end of one session, that two chapters of the laws were duplicates of another two chapters. The thoroughness of that Legislature was proved up to the hilt by its repeal of one law three separate times: by section 3 of chapter 75, by section 2 of chapter 123, and by section 7 of chapter 124. The sober second thought followed fast upon the heels of the first impulse when chapter 318 was amended by chapter 319. More confusing was the procedure in reference to another law, which was repealed, and afterward amended and repealed again. A law governing the inspection of hotels and lodging houses contains what Gov. Hodges calls "three distinct, different, and diametrically opposite sections." Even a lawyer, he fears, could not possibly say when the law becomes operative, "and yet this bill was drawn in the origin by its friends and handled by them all through its process of enactment."

"If any stallion or jack," read one bit of legislation, "escape from his owner by accident, he shall be liable for all damages, but shall not be liable to be fined as above

provided." The Governor hopes that the courts will construe this regulation without too close attention to its grammar. It is less reprehensible, however, than a bill that had for its purpose an increase of from 3 to 13 cents a day in the amount of wages paid to the wives and children of convicts of the State. So clumsily was it drawn that the Attorney-General had to bring his imagination to the rescue in order to continue paying the three cents, let alone the additional ten that the bill was intended to provide. It is not the most uncommon thing in law-making for a measure to pass both houses twice; a more unfortunate phenomenon is the appearance of a negative which reverses a bill's desired effect. A favorite device of the opponents of a measure is to move to strike out the enacting clause, but in Kansas—and doubtless in many other States—bills reach the Governor quite innocent of this decoration. If one found in the early statutes of Oklahoma a full set of regulations for the government of harbors, wharfage, and lighthouses, one might conclude that a Swiss navy was not such an absurdity as it is usually regarded. The explanation is, however, that these regulations were taken bodily from the laws of Texas, with what we must admire as extraordinary long-sightedness.

Many hours were spent by the Kansas Legislature that committed these various misdeeds in discussing and passing a bill relating to "chiropractic." The Governor was wary and allowed the bill to become law without his signature. Upon examining it closely, he found that it required him to appoint as members of a board three "chiropractors" who had practiced their art in Kansas for two years in the immediate past. But in order to comply with this provision, he would have been compelled to appoint men or women who had been openly violating the medical registration laws of the State for the same length of time. He did not care to undertake that responsibility. The worst thing about this precious bill was that it, and others no better, like the "pure shoe" bill, had consumed so much time that the closing days of the session were choked with legislation of the utmost importance, for which there could not be even a pretence of deliberation and which accordingly failed. In law-making, it is a fatal error to keep the good wine until the last.

Whatever "chiropractic" was or may be, it occupied the attention of more Legislatures last year than one. While Kansas was arguing its merits, California also was impressed with the duty of providing a State board to examine and certify "chiropractors." Some of the legislators of the Golden State had a larger vision, and proposed to have a similar board for barbers—for which, indeed, some argument might be found. But these measures were of small import beside others of the four thousand of that session. "To eat," began one, "to work, and to be recompensed for enforced idleness is hereby declared to be the inalienable right of

every man, woman, and child in this State." It ended by conferring upon the Governor authority to appoint a "citizen of this State to be designated as the Commissioner for the Abolishment of Poverty." One bill gave school boards power to regulate the dress of school children. (An Ohio legislator recently proposed to protect the modest feelings of himself and his fellow-Buckeyes by a drastic law relating to women's apparel, but his colleagues felt unequal to the job.) Another bill created the office of Bee Commissioner. A third made it a misdemeanor to keep any bird in a cage less than three feet square; the height seems to have been immaterial. Still another graciously provided that soldiers who did not like the fare at the Veterans' Home might commute their privileges there into a pension and live where they pleased. One member of this Legislature remarked that it was attempting to regulate everything but the birth-rate—surely a most incautious suggestion.

II.

It must be evident that even our best Legislatures are only human. Gov. Hodges admits as much when, after pointing out the inexcusable mistakes of omission and commission made by the law-makers of his own State, he says: "With all that, the Kansas Legislature of 1913 was as efficient, as capable, as upright and honest, as any Legislature that ever sat; it passed many wholesome laws. There was not a single suspicion of corruption." Taking from this praise the proper discount for local patriotism, we nevertheless are forced to the conclusion that the Legislature won't do. Like the steam engine, it is a terrible waster of energy. We have no choice but to follow the example of the farmer in the fable and rely upon ourselves. Yet this ideal, being an ideal, is impossible of realization. Most of our time—and, if the truth be confessed, our interest—is taken up with private affairs. We shall have to retain the Legislature for the routine. But we can have some push-buttons, neatly labelled I., R., and R., which we will push when we can't get what we want otherwise.

The Recall button we do not use much. Cities adopt it in a pleasant glow of anticipation over the new bit of machinery, but when they realize that, despite the sweet abruptness that its name suggests, it means in plain English holding an election over again, their customary reluctance to enjoy the voter's prerogative oftener than is necessary asserts itself with paralyzing effect. Perhaps they have a glimmer, also, of the uncomplimentary fact that, while the Initiative and the Referendum are indications of our distrust of the Legislature, the Recall shows distrust in ourselves. Inertia is thus enforced by the ethical principle—or the sporting instinct—that we deserve to suffer the results of our acts.

But the I. and R., that two-headed hammer of Thor, is subject to no such qualifications. We invented it to do the work that our Legislatures would not do. It is a bit

puzzling, therefore, to find that it is not always swung with effectiveness—but this is the verdict of the highest authorities, that is, the warmest advocates of it. "We are very sorry," sighed *Equity* some months ago, "that South Dakota, the first State to have the I. and R. in its Constitution, voted against a Constitutional Convention. We hoped that this State would also take the lead in drawing and adopting a thoroughly modern State Constitution. But, like Indiana"—like Indiana, one of the States that are still wandering in the wilderness without the I. and R. pillar of cloud and fire—"it missed its opportunity. Now instead of being a leader, it will become a follower." An I. and R. State a follower! Is such a thing conceivable? Then there is Colorado. "Efforts to alter or improve the Initiative and Referendum amendment in the Colorado Constitution . . . proved unavailing." Proposition No. 4, in which Judge Lindsey's Social Service League was particularly interested, was defeated by a vote of two to one. The failure of these amendments is attributed to "the general reaction experienced in other States" also. Of all the proposals submitted to the people last November that can fairly be called progressive, no less than 60 per cent. were voted down. A Legislature could hardly have done worse.

Indeed, if it had been a Legislature that had done so badly, there would have been the solace of saying that the people had been misrepresented. But when the voters betray themselves, who is there to mourn? Even Arizona, despite her leadership in forms of self-government, wavered. By an oversight that is simply unaccountable in so enlightened a community, she had failed to guard measures adopted through the instrumentality of the I. and R. from repeal by the Legislature. From the Governor she had taken the power of veto over such laws, but the legislative wolf was free to gobble them up. Surely there could be no doubt of an overwhelming majority for an amendment that merely prohibited the Legislature from undoing the work of the people. Yet the vote was 16,567 for and 16,484 against—a majority of 83 votes in a total of 33,000. To add to the mystery, it appears that only two-thirds of those voting on candidates voted either way on this "important improvement," although three-fourths of the whole number voting voted upon such comparatively trivial matters as a \$5,000,000 highways bond issue, old age and mothers' pension laws, and the creation of a new county.

III.

Legislatures are human. Can it be that voters are human, too? Yet how else explain their attitude upon measures in which those who would liberate them from the representative yoke are so deeply interested? It is not only that they vote wrongly. That is their right. As *Equity* graciously concedes, "they should vote for or against, as best suits their sovereign pleasures." But

what if they fail to vote at all? In Minnesota, an I. and R. amendment received 168,004 votes in November, with only 41,577 against it. Yet it was defeated, because the cruel Constitution provides that an amendment can be carried only by a majority of the total vote cast, not for it, but for candidates who are running at the same time. As the candidates polled 356,000 votes, the amendment fell short of adoption by 10,000 votes. A pitifully narrow margin! But look at the figures again, and see whether the case of the defeated amendment is so pitiful. The candidates polled 356,000 votes. The vote on the amendment, including both favorable and adverse ballots, was 209,000. Two voters in every five were indifferent to the amendment, and yet it almost went into the Constitution. The one amendment that was carried received only 223,000 votes.

This indifference is so common that the apostles of direct government have made it an article of their faith that a majority of those voting on a measure shall be sufficient to carry it. Those who do not vote upon it shall not be counted. "People who don't know enough to vote on a question or are not enough interested to do so, are not entitled to be counted as against those who are for it." Voters shall be divided into three classes: supporters, opponents, and indifferent. The indifferent may outnumber the other two, but the fight shall be decided without them.

The objection to this position goes to the centre of the cry that government must be restored to the people. If a majority of the voters regularly fail to vote for laws that are submitted to them, so that it becomes necessary to provide that those who do not vote upon them shall not be counted either for or against them, does it not look as if the people were not quite so eager to "rule" as those who assume to speak for them, had thought? And is it consistent with professed regard for the popular will to provide that the indifferent, instead of counting as indifferent, shall not count at all? Is there not a right of indifference? Must the voter drop everything else and line up on one side or the other whenever eight per cent. of his fellow-voters so demand? The fact is that the advocates of direct government have shifted from their original position of restoring government to the people and are now pleading for putting it into the hands of any group that is more interested in a particular question than is the mass of citizens.

The suspicion that voters are made out of the same clay as Legislatures is strengthened by the occasional circumstance of the adoption of two conflicting measures at the same election. It is a little difficult to blame Legislatures for doing in the busy grind what the voter does with ample time for preparation. The danger has been rather cleverly met in some States by a provision that if two conflicting measures are carried, the one receiving the larger number of votes shall stand. It is somewhat of a shock to find that the sovereign people must

be provided with protection, not only against Legislatures, but even against itself.

One valuable contribution to political philosophy that has been made by advocates of the I. and R. must not be overlooked. The objection that "the fundamental distinction between Constitution and ordinary statutes will be destroyed is not nearly so formidable as many American writers and statesmen would have us believe, because the distinction between them is really very hard to determine." This profound observation, which occurs in a pamphlet published by the State Historical Society of Iowa, if it does not throw much light upon the problem of government, at all events enables us to measure our progress since the days of the novices who drew up the Federal Constitution.

Correspondence.

A WORD TO THE MODERATELY RICH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As one of the moderately rich, with an income, say, of \$10,000 to \$25,000 a year, I want to express my conviction that the great majority of us, including myself, are acting like hogs. With millions suffering for food and care in Belgium, Servia, and Poland, I doubt if there is a single one of us in the whole United States who has taken the situation sufficiently to heart to make any appreciable sacrifice to help relieve it. By an appreciable sacrifice, I mean any real curtailment of our pleasure at all comparable to that involved in the giving of half a dollar by a laboring man or woman. Many of us have given a few hundreds or perhaps a thousand or two; but I don't believe a single one has gone without a new car or a summer trip or anything in that class, on account of what he has given to relief funds. If there is such a one, I should very much like to get his address. Let me ask these people if it would not be little enough for them to give some of the relief funds as much as a half or quarter of their annual surplus, which they would otherwise salt down for the benefit of children already, in most cases, suffering from the effects of too much luxury. To descend to personalities, I had given up to June about \$600 to the different funds, and my friends seemed to think that that was doing quite well; but when I found that the exigencies of my family demanded a \$1,000 trip and a new \$2,000 car, I felt so cheap that I sopped my conscience by sending \$2,000 to the Servians. Not that this removes the mark of the hog. I ought to give another \$5,000 without batting an eye, but I am not man enough. What I will do, though, is to give another \$2,000 to the Belgian Red Cross Fund, if nine or more other readers of the *Nation* will give an equal amount to any of the relief funds; and I will send a check to your care whenever you say that I should do so. O.

HOLDING BACK WHEAT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As I write this I am on a railway train going through the richest part of the Nebraska winter wheat belt. One week ago

to-day I came through the spring wheat belt of North Dakota and Minnesota. In spite of a very wet season in the former territory, what appears to be a bumper crop has been cut, and all accounts agree that in the latter the yield promises to be 10 per cent. above expectations. In both sections I notice a peculiar condition, viz., the farmers are stacking their wheat. In the last one hundred miles I have noticed but one threshing machine at work. In the West farmers have no way of holding wheat after it is threshed except to sack it, and the cost of sacks makes this method too costly. Where they intend holding it they stack it, otherwise they haul it directly from shock to the thresher, and the grain, in box body wagons, directly from the thresher to the elevator, where they receive cash for it. It is very evident, then, that there is a widespread determination among the farmers to hold their wheat.

At breakfast this morning I met a man and our conversation centred on this subject. He said he was interested in a number of threshing machines, and that this was the poorest season his business had ever known, although the grain was there and would have to be threshed sooner or later. To my question as to why the farmers were making such elaborate preparations for holding the crop he replied:

"It's the war. I've got it figured out this way. A very fair proportion of the farmers in this section are Germans and are anti-Ally in their sentiments. As a rule, these German farmers are prosperous and are influential in their counties. These men feel that if the American wheat crop is marketed, it will be an aid to the Allies—the English especially—and they are going around among their neighbors and telling them that the Dardanelles cannot be forced, and that wheat is bound to go to \$2 a bushel before long, advising them to hold it."

Whether this theory is correct or not, I cannot say. I tell the tale as 'twas told to me. That the wheat is being held beyond any precedent is a certainty. I am connected with a large granger railway, and I know that our loading of grain is running about twenty-five cars a day, when with average crop conditions it should be four hundred at this season.

JAMES B. LATIMER.

Chicago, August 31.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A pamphlet bearing the names of Fred-eric Bancroft, John H. Latané, and Dunbar Rowland, and the title, "Why the American Historical Association Needs Thorough Reorganization," has just been distributed to the Association's members. Its purpose is to carry further the campaign which was waged largely in the columns of the *Nation* last year. Its contents comprise an introduction, a description by Dr. Bancroft of certain existing irregularities, and a schedule of reforms proposed by Professor Latané. Dr. Bancroft, a recent convert to the movement, writes with more acerbity than may be generally approved; and the stress which he lays upon the frequency of payments from the treasury of the *American Historical Review* for the travelling expenses of its editors may be considered undue. These items are of some significance, however, as indications that the group of men who have long been and are still in control

of the Association and its organ of publication have had their sense of trusteeship in some degree dulled. The temper in which certain spokesmen of that group have replied to criticisms tends to strengthen this impression.

But whatever may be the reader's reaction to Dr. Bancroft's indictment, the constructive proposals of Professor Latané are bound to commend themselves to a multitude of the members. They are:

"(1.) The present editors of the *Review* must renounce the claim of editorial ownership and recognize their position as agents of the Association, or give place to a board that will.

"(2.) The mysterious relation that exists between the *Review* and the Carnegie Institution of Washington should be made known to the Association. This information will be called for at the next annual meeting. The arrangement should be continued only in case it suits the best interests of the Association.

"(3.) There is no good reason for allowing the ex-presidents undemocratic life-membership on the Council. Whether objectionable formerly or not, it is now thoroughly objectionable for several well-known reasons; one of them is that some ex-presidents are actively engaged in academic work, have axes to grind, and their presence on the Council virtually deprives the Association of self-government.

"(4.) The practice of promoting the vice-presidents to the presidency has produced unsatisfactory results and should be discontinued. It has given to the ring the backing of three aspirants to the presidency by determining the order of their succession, thus making it all but impossible to break the slate annually prepared by the inner circle.

"(5.) All attempts to end boss-and-ring rule will be futile while the managing editor and members of the board are allowed to be on the Council. The Council should elect and dominate the editorial board and the board should aid and direct the managing editor. It is tolerating just the reverse of all this that has been the direct or indirect cause of most of the unfortunate conditions in the Association.

"(6.) No personal expenses should be paid except after formal approval by a finance committee, and the treasurer's annual report to the Council and to the Association should contain individual and itemized statements of all such expenses."

As a newly elected member of the Council, I have felt it a duty to increase my knowledge of the workings of the Association and to study the possible means of betterment. I have learned that the minutes of the earlier meetings, at which the status of the *Review* was legislated upon, are in part missing and in part, as the present secretary has written me, palpably erroneous. Under these conditions, every person is in a measure free to form his own theory of the official relation between the Association and the *Review*, and no man may convince another of his error. Such a state of things clearly calls for new legislation; and this should be of such a sort as to make the editors of the *Review* definitely the servants, and not the masters, of the Association.

At the present time I find myself in favor of all of Professor Latané's proposals, excepting possibly the fourth in his list. I shall keep an open mind, however, until the time for definite action is at hand. I earnestly hope—and here without doubt I voice the

thought of nearly three thousand fellow-members—that the discussion will progress in the utmost mutual good will. Recrimination is wholly out of place. Those who are in controlling office have rendered excellent service, and at the worst have committed errors of judgment in minor concerns and errors of interpretation where the legislation has been ambiguous. On the other hand, the reformers are men of equally high character and public spirit. Exaggeration and harsh words can only hurt the party which uses them. The problem is not as to who shall fill the offices, but as to what offices there shall be and what the functions of their incumbents.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

Bellport, L. I., August 6.

FREDERIC BANCROFT'S REPLY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Professor Phillips's *pro tanto* declaration for reform will surprise no one less than the joint authors of the pamphlet he refers to. If he had been able to attend any of our conferences, perhaps he would have advanced with us. On a mere hint he was ready to join in demanding information when officials were trying to keep it back. And what he says about "the group of men who have long been and still are in control of the Association and its organ of publication" having "their sense of trusteeship in some degree dulled," and about "certain spokesmen of that group"—these are ample evidences of independence and courage.

It is important now to guard against any inference that our six propositions were intended to be adequate to the "thorough reorganization" demanded. Those propositions are entitled "Some Proposed Reforms," and the present writer speaks for the joint authors in saying that those propositions are little more than fundamentals. They are followed by a request for suggestions, so that the Association can "develop and push through at the next annual meeting a plan that will end the evils long complained of in vain." Consequently, since the pamphlet was sent out, July 1, there has been an almost continuous stream of most gratifying letters.

In due time the joint authors and an increasing number of active colleagues will give all interested in the reform movement a careful account of what has been done and will make some suggestions about candidates and further reforms. Any time in October will be early enough to fill out the blank ballots recently received from the nominating committee. While asking for suggestions, this committee manifests its eagerness to continue ring-rule by appealing to "a long-standing precedent" to advance one of the ring, although this very precedent is one of our fundamental grievances. The ring itself is, alas, "a long-standing precedent," which could hardly have been possible except by the trades, dickers, and combinations involved in this advancement of its own members through the presidential offices. The sophistry is too feeble and transparent to mislead any one that really desires reform.

For the present, a sentence or two from each of a few letters, characteristic of many, may speak for themselves:

A widely known professor in a large Eastern university writes: "I am grateful for the pamphlet on ways that are dark and

tricks that are vain, as exemplified by the shining lights of the American Historical Association. I have been a member of that organization for a dozen years or more, during all of which time I have never had the slightest doubt that strong-arm work was being done to keep out all interlopers from the sacred circle. . . . No whitewashing tactics will go down with a great many members."

A member of the council: "I do not believe that any one will contend after reading that document that there is no ring in the American Historical Association, or that you have [not] successfully disclosed the nature of that ring. The demonstration is so clear that I am surprised that no one was ever before able to locate that powerful organization."

An editor of an historical magazine: "I was amazed at the disclosures. The actual 'ring' and its methods were not unknown to me, and my voice has been raised against them for a great many years; but it seems to me that you, in your pamphlet, have put your fingers upon the sore places and pointed out the remedy."

A New York city professor and man-of-letters: "I do not think that 'shocked' is too strong a word to express my feelings in reading your revelations, at least some of them, for I had known for some time that 'things were not right.'"

A military historian: "Well, you surely make out a strong case on two charges: financial mismanagement, to use no harsher term, and unconstitutional administration. On these two lines there ought, and doubtless will, be drastic reforms instituted at the next meeting."

A distinguished New England historian: "I read the circular with great interest. You certainly fired hot shot into the 'ring.' I've watched the papers to see whether its members haven't quietly died, as their only simple means of escape!"

Another in the same region: "I think, also, you have shown that the editors have established a system of control of the Association, which should not be allowed to continue. The exposure you have made of it should be sufficient to cause it to be abandoned."

A Maryland historian: "This pamphlet ought to arouse the interest of every member, and . . . I am willing to do all that I can to help you in this most worthy cause."

A New York lawyer: "I am glad that you had the nerve to fire shrapnel at those literary bosses."

The reformers intend to see to it that there shall be neither forgetting nor twisting nor false explaining of the facts set forth in the pamphlet. They will hew to that line. Those facts cannot be successfully controverted. It is now more than eight months since the editorial board was challenged to explain by what right it had claimed the ownership of the *Review*. Where probably not one other member of the Association, out of the whole 3,000, could have been convinced, the board has wisely not attempted to answer. It is more than four months since this same board was also challenged to explain why a December meeting had for many years been secretly called at great expense to the treasury, and thirty days after a November meeting, when all the business of the *Review* was, or should have been, transacted at one of those meetings. This secret December meeting enabled

the members of the board to get their expenses paid to the annual meeting. Many other serious charges were made in the pamphlet. No one has even attempted to deny any of them, except privately and by representations that will easily be refuted if published. Moreover, the facts for every material statement in the pamphlet were learned from the Association's records; and the officials criticised were, in most cases, first privately given an opportunity to offer explanations.

The slight beginnings of reform that have already been started have been obtained only by virtual compulsion. Considering the offences and the conduct since those offences have become known, we are unable to classify them as mere errors of judgment. And the men that are responsible for them are surely not proper custodians of the reform movement. Let us take an example.

After the increasing demand for some reform could no longer be resisted, the council, ruled by the ring, brought forward a plan to refer the question of a reorganization of the Association to a committee of nine. This, it was assumed, would give the Association a fair opportunity to decide as to what it wished. Just at this time the Association was startled by the claim that the *Review* belonged to the editorial board, most of whom are members of the well-known ring. This claim of ownership was stoutly challenged at the council meeting last December, until a compromise was struck by which it was agreed that the question of the relationship of the *Review* to the Association should be referred to this, of course impartial, committee of nine. But straightway the ring, still holding the entire machinery of procedure, easily managed to have such a committee chosen that it promptly selected as its chairman a member of the ring; for there were not more than one or two reformers among the nine, and they had never been either conspicuous or outspoken. And this chairman was formerly director of the Carnegie Department of Historical Research and the managing editor of the *Review*, and he has maintained the most intimate relations with his successor, who is the one most to blame for "boss-and-ring rule." This being the case, what more natural than that this chairman should be zealous in protecting these non-Association interests? Accordingly, after the compromise had been made, and shortly before the business meeting of the Association was to convene, he begged the present writer, at the request of the aforesaid boss, not to say anything at that meeting about the relationship between the Carnegie Department and the *Review*. As the writer then knew next to nothing about that relationship, and as the question did not come up, the request was necessarily complied with. Moreover, there are other members of that committee and of others who have been beneficiaries of that Department and its director. Bosses in distress are sometimes urgent, and grateful human nature is sometimes weak. Therefore, it's well not to forget the proverb as to whom God helps.

Unmindful of these facts, some persons have thought it strange that the reformers would not trust their plans to that committee and coöperate with it. The facts should sufficiently explain our attitude as to the past and the present. As to the future, I am authorized to be equally explicit. If harmony and coöperation in the interest of the

whole Association are desired by those who have been the cause of the lack of them, they can easily be obtained, so far as the reformers are concerned, if only the unfairly made up committee of nine will properly reorganize. The reformers do not ask for a majority; one-third would suffice. If even two members of that committee, including the chairman, will withdraw, and the committee will admit two representative reformers, then the work of genuine reform could begin at once and be ready to be reported to the annual meeting in Washington next December.

But, of course, a proposition so fair and sure to bring peace and harmony to all but a few will not be accepted. The kind of reform desired by those interested in boss-and-ring rule was provided for when the committee was appointed. And since then the good but unwise boss has generously been peddling assurances that reforms satisfactory to the Association would be granted. Unfortunately this began several months before the work of the committee even commenced. Not unnaturally, this has afforded the reformers much amusement. Moreover, experience has taught them to look for infallible aids in the absurd claims and the ridiculous attitudes of the ring, and especially of its boss. The comparatively few reformers that have been deceived by these assurances—that reforms were to be vouchsafed by inveterate anti-reformers—will in due season throw off their illusions. And that will be in time to vote for the needed "thorough reorganization" that has been both promised and provided for.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

Washington, D. C., September 5.

ANOTHER PROTEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a circular letter received to-day from the nominating committee of the American Historical Association, I find the following paragraph:

"The committee assumes that, at least until further action by the Association, the long-standing precedent of advancing the existing vice-presidents to or towards the presidency will be followed, but the blanks below afford opportunity of expressing dissent from this practice."

The first vice-president is Prof. George L. Burr, one of the editors of the *American Historical Review*. I regret exceedingly that the members of the editorial ring, which has for years controlled the affairs of the Association, should persist in their efforts to advance to the presidency another member of the board of editors of the *Review*, while the transactions of that board which have been the subject of serious criticism are still under investigation by members of the Council. Furthermore, the members of that board have advanced what appears to be a wholly untenable and preposterous claim of proprietorship in the *Review*.

In thus attempting to elect another one of their number to the presidency, the editorial ring are pursuing their accustomed tactics of trying to becloud the issue. They hope that their candidate can win for them something like a vote of confidence. If they really want a vote of confidence, why do they not resign in a body and put the issue squarely before the Association? Professor Burr should refuse to permit his name to be used in connection with the presidency until the Association has had a chance to pass upon the

questions already at issue. While my personal relations with him have always been of the pleasantest character, I shall oppose at all hazards his election to the presidency until the questions involving the ownership and status of the *Review* have been satisfactorily settled. If the editorial ring persists in its plan, and he permits the use of his name, the reformers will gladly accept the challenge and spare no effort to defeat his election at Washington next December.

When charges of ring-rule were first made, we were asked for a bill of particulars. We have given it. If further evidence is demanded, we stand ready to supply it, for since the publication of the pamphlet, "Why the American Historical Association Needs Thorough Reorganization," many additional facts have been brought to our attention.

JOHN H. LATANE.

Baltimore, September 3.

THE WAR'S GEOGRAPHY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: War may be a good teacher of geography, but there are those who are slow to learn. Perhaps a few examples in proof of this assertion will be appreciated by those of your readers who echo Flaubert's joy over the absurdities of his fellows.

Last September a friend of mine was greatly comforted because, hearing that the Russians were approaching West Prussia, he thought they must be crossing the Rhine. That was early in the war, but only last month another friend thought the Germans, in marching upon Warsaw after the capture of Lemberg, were being lured by the crafty Russians farther and farther away from Berlin. An eminent Harvard professor stated in an article the other day that Germany is only half the size of Texas. Perhaps he meant that she would be if reduced to the proportions he would choose for her. A glaring head-line in one of our leading dailies announced that Bavarian troops were being rushed through Rumania to the defence of Cracow. Why Rumania's neutrality should be violated for the sake of taking Bavarians 800 miles out of their way was not explained. A favorite error concerns the proportion of France occupied by the Germans. The special war correspondent of a widely circulating and complacent magazine declared last November that this section was a fourth of the country; a distinguished pro-German divine declared in March that it was a fifth; the other day I heard it described as a third. As a matter of fact, since their retreat from the Marne, the Germans have held one-twenty-third of France.

But the most delicious blunder I have found occurred in a letter from Germany, published in a New York paper. The writer was loyally predicting the division of the spoils by the victorious Kaiser. After Germany and Austria had been satisfied, Rumania was to receive "a part of Arabia." What part? The desert or that which belongs to Turkey? Was the poor, faithful ally to be robbed for the sake of neutral Rumania? And what was that country to do with her new possession, separated from her by the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and the Suez Canal? At last the truth came to me. "A part of Arabia" is the typographical for Bessarabia, which any one can find on the map if he looks for it.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College, August 28.

Book Notes and Byways

A LYRIC MIRACLE.

By LOUISE IMOGEN GUINEY.

TO A LADY WHO ASK'D WHAT HE CHIEFLY
ADMIR'D IN HER.

All over I'm in Love with Thee,
As Thou all over lovely art!
There's not a Part but pleases me
Except thy proud, ungentle Heart.

Your Beauty's Light is evident
Though where or how, we cannot say:
Thus unseen Stars I th' Element
United, make the Milky Way.

Whoever loves your Eyes alone,
A Kind Look only should be his;
And he whose Lips but dwell upon
The Praise of Yours, should lose his Kiss.

I love each Charm, each Grace, alike,
And to them All give all my Heart!
Love did my breast too deeply strike
For Me to know, or name, the Dart.

No student whose ear is sensitive to the undertones of English letters, or to their chronological cadence, would hesitate to give a date to the little poem quoted above. That date, surely, would fall between 1630 and 1650, the perturbed years which managed to bequeath to us the neat melody of "Bid me to live and I will live," and "When first I saw your face," and "Ask me no more." The lines have the romantic point and the dash of languid elegance which belong to "the Warres"; they have also the slightly sophisticated pose, the easily avoidable errors of form—in fact, "the whole bag of tricks." Though not fit to rank with the divine things of the Caroline day, these stanzas are yet recognizably, essentially, and lovably Caroline.

They tell a pleasant tale in Oxford of a distinguished architect who had come to prescribe for some ailing mediæval shrine. He was taken about and shown the half-dozen astonishing specimens of local "after-Gothic"; and first of these, the staircase of Christ Church Hall; and he admired heartily the beautiful spaces above him, the single supporting pillar, and the tenderly wrought fan-vaulting. His host, dean or canon, wickedly feigning, asked: "Just what style and period?" Said the distinguished architect: "Perpendicular; very nice, too. Not later than the end of the fourteenth century." The other went on ever so gently: "What if I could prove to you by our documents that this staircase was built by one 'Smith of London' in 1640?" The visitor's answer is historical. "Sir, no number of documents could prove to me anything which is on the face of it impossible!"

So with the equally astonishing "after-Gothic" of our relic. It is not what it ought to be, but what it has no business to be. We have here no lost manuscript of some contemporary of Suckling's, nor even a modern strain akin to that, such as the nineteenth century could, and sometimes did, play to the charmed ear. We are accustomed to think of Rochester as the very last English poet of the unbroken line in whose throat the Elizabethan nightingale

—Winter'd, and kept warm her note.

But is the strange beauty of emotion never absent from Rochester's best present in "All over I'm in Love with Thee"? No. That song comes (O unguessable origin!) from the bulky obsolete Posthumous Works in Prose and

Verse of Mr. William Wycherley! Such is the "proof of what is on the face of it impossible." The date of publication is 1728, Wycherley being then for some thirteen years dead.

Of all the unblest Georgian argosies, launched under the full sail of a once great reputation, of all the barren unknown scrolls charged with nothing but dull sense and duller ribaldry, commend us to Wycherley's books of verse, posthumous or otherwise, though the posthumous one is the least forbidding of them. Yet there is this gay winning lilt, like a jewel in a nettle-bed. Wycherley, despite Pope's splendid adjective for him (well enough borne out, it must be admitted, in Spence's *Anecdotes*) is surely, even as a dramatist, a nearly perished name. And who has ever been tempted to think of him as a precious minor poet, and put him in anthologies for the fair? Yet again, for once in his life, there is he, the serene producer, and here are we, the boggled consumers of real poetry! Despite its confusion of personal pronouns and its iteration of rhyme, his conceit of compliment is well-nigh perfect in its kind. It does not withhold its own playful hint of immortality. A lady, a young archly smiling lady of many patches and furbelows, would have a stout middle-aged celebrity confess to her under the boughs of Spring Gardens, or by the courtly candle-light of Vauxhall, what He chiefly Admir'd in Her. Well, she has this exquisite little answer to hover like a butterfly over her forgotten grave. It is almost as if Dianeme had asked the selfsame question of Herrick.

Literature

THE RELIGIOUS QUEST OF INDIA.

Indian Theism from the Vedic to the Muhammadan Period. By Nicol Macnicol. Oxford University Press. 6s. net.

The Heart of Jainism. By Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson. Oxford University Press. 7s. net.

Messrs. J. N. Farquhar and H. G. Griswold, both of them secretaries of organized missions in India and men of liberal views and solid scholarship, are editing a series of books entitled "The Religious Quest of India," the first two volumes of which are now ready. The aim of the series is twofold: to present the facts of the various Indian religions in scientific fashion, supplementing historical investigation with the intimate acquaintance with present-day conditions which the missionary possesses as few others do, and secondly "to set each form of Indian religion by the side of Christianity in such a way that the relationship may stand out clear." The writers of the series do not forget that they are missionaries as well as scholars, and their first aim is the vindication and the victory of the Cross. One may indeed question whether such aims and authorship promise well for the impartiality of the series. It might even be argued that a religion could hardly be presented sympathetically or even justly by one whose chief aim in life is to destroy it. Yet, as the editors remark, "no man approaches the study of a religion without religious convictions either positive or negative: for both

reader and writer, therefore, it is better that these should be explicitly stated at the outset." Knowing the authors' point of view in advance, it is not difficult to abstract from it. Moreover, the writers of these series are not missionaries of the old school, but have real sympathy for the religious views of the people among whom they are working; and, besides, one may always skip the last chapter.

It cannot be said that Dr. Macnicol's "Indian Theism" has contributed anything of importance to our knowledge of his subject. The period which he treats has been carefully studied by many able scholars, and as it came to an end three hundred years ago, the "close and direct contact with Indian religious life" from which the series is supposed to draw so much of its value, is able to contribute very little. Hence the book is hardly more than a summary of the work done by many preceding writers, covering in 189 pages a period of about 3,000 years. To be sure, the book does not end with this, but has two additional chapters, one a kind of summary of the summary (entitled *The Theology*), while the other (*Criticism and Appreciation*) is a comparison of "the theology" with "the standard Theism of Christianity." Dr. Macnicol's book is sound, scholarly, just, at times even sympathetic, and makes a good introduction to the study of Hindu theistic speculation; but it cannot be called an important work.

A very different book is Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson's "The Heart of Jainism"; for here we have a religion which is still in need of minute scholarly investigation, and in the presentation of which the missionary's "close and direct contact" with the life of the people will be of the greatest value. Jainism was one of the last of the ancient Oriental religions to become an object of study for Western scholars. Until the '80's, in fact, it was generally considered (in spite of the emphatic protests of the Jainas themselves) an offshoot of Buddhism, and a very uninteresting one at that. Thanks to the researches of Bühler and Jacobi, however, it was shown conclusively that Jainism was older than Buddhism, and hence one of the oldest religions in the world. In spite of this, it roused very little interest in the West, and until recently was hardly more than a name to Europeans, outside of a small circle of Sanscritists. The works in England upon it were mostly hidden away in learned journals or in the rather forbidding "Sacred Books of the East"; and the chapter on Jainism in Hopkins's "Religions of India"—a book that has had so large an influence with the reading public—did little more than spread the conviction that this was a particularly unimportant and uninteresting faith, and caricatured it as "a religion in which the chief points insisted on are that one should deny God, worship man, and nourish vermin." In 1903, however, Bühler's little book, "The Indian Sect of the Jainas," was translated into English, and in 1909, 1910, and 1912, respectively, three other short works, written in popular form, were published. The first of

these was Barodia's "History and Literature of Jainism," the second Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson's "Notes on Modern Jainism"—by far the best piece of work that had been done on the present religious condition of the Jains; while the third (entitled "Jainism") was by Mr. Herbert Warren, an English convert to the religion which he expounds in over-sympathetic fashion.

The surprising dearth of literature in English upon a religion that is older than Buddha makes Mrs. Stevenson's new book upon the subject doubly welcome. There is no other work in which one can find the history, the doctrines, and the present customs and conditions of the Jains expounded with thoroughness and in detail. And certainly few other scholars would have been able to do what Mrs. Stevenson has done. For she combines with a knowledge of the ancient sources an intimate acquaintance with present-day Jains and their Gujarati writings. For eight years, as a missionary in Kathiawad (the centre of Jainism) she has had almost unequalled opportunities to know the men and women of whom she writes, observe their customs, and understand their feelings.

The first five chapters of her book are devoted to the origin of Jainism, the life of its founder or great reformer, and the subsequent history of the Jaina community. Then follow three chapters on Jaina philosophy—a section which (owing to the Jaina insistence upon dividing and subdividing everything in heaven and on earth), necessarily makes hard reading. Perhaps the most important as well as the most interesting section of the book is that which immediately follows the philosophical part, and deals with the life of the Jaina layman and monk, and the religious ceremonies and customs which only one who has lived for years in a Jaina community could describe. In this section of her work Mrs. Stevenson has done for Jainism what the Abbé Dubois did a hundred years ago for Hinduism.

Mrs. Stevenson is a missionary, and she believes that Jainism is bound some day to yield absolutely to Christianity. This, however, does not prevent her from bringing to her study of the religion which she seeks to destroy a very considerable sympathy, and though the reader is constantly reminded that the author is a missionary, he also feels convinced that there is little prejudice and a great deal of real appreciation involved in her account. The fact that the Jaina views everything from the ethical rather than the merely metaphysical or superstitious point of view, is clearly brought out, and the ready idealism and real kindness of most Jaina men and women is abundantly recognized. The author's sense of humor gleams through the scholarly exposition at many points, but she has wisely kept it under considerable restraint, lest in presenting ideas so different from ours she should make the reader laugh when he should seek to understand and sympathize.

In one respect only is the book disappointing—namely, in its failure to make any men-

tion of the very interesting campaign of reform and revival which forms the centre of discussion in the Jaina community to-day. Groups of young Jaina idealists have been formed in various parts of India, organizations have been founded, periodicals published, and schools established with the aim of abolishing various ancient evils and bringing Jainism "up to date." Of all this one gleams no hint in Mrs. Stevenson's book. But of course, it may well be that this reform movement is only a passing phenomenon, and it is possibly for this reason that Mrs. Stevenson thought best to omit it altogether in her presentation of a religion which is 2,500 years old. At all events, it must be said that she has succeeded as none of her predecessors in laying bare to us the Heart of Jainism.

CURRENT FICTION.

A Young Man's Year. By Anthony Hope. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The author of "The Prisoner of Zenda" and "The Dolly Dialogues" has successfully outlived those youthful triumphs. He will now hardly equal them in point of popularity, but indeed he appears to have nothing of the kind in view. A romancer who deliberately addicts himself to the fiction of "real life," of every-day scenes and people, must expect to find his reward largely in a sense of virtue. But Mr. Hawkins here attempts nothing beyond his powers. His story compares favorably with the fiction of those somewhat younger contemporaries who have abjured romance from the outset. His materials are such as might have been employed by Messrs. Cannan, Mackenzie, Walpole, and company. A young man in London, his adventures material, social, and amatory, rather particularly the last: here is the familiar stuff of current British story-telling. Mr. Hawkins handles it in his own way, and we dare say the younger generation may discern in that way traces of an abhorred Victorianism.

For one thing, his young man is not the queerly named offspring of vulgar parents, but a gentleman. For another thing, he does not marry a barmaid, or achieve an intrigue with a beautiful woman of fashion, or possess himself of a music-hall favorite; though there are moments when we are afraid that (in general terms) he may do any of these things. A maiden of low degree, a pretty actress, and a reigning beauty are all involved in the year of adventure here recorded. But having created Arthur Lisle a gentleman, Mr. Hawkins is so old-fashioned as to hold him to his estate. He has faults and temptations enough, but contends with them, on the whole, pretty creditably. Even the wiles of beautiful Bernedette (who is not without kinship to the Dolly of the Dialogues), though they are too much for his heart, fail to corrupt him. He comes through his year's apprenticeship cleanly, and is properly rewarded, as, after all, people some-

times are in real life. He becomes, by apparently trivial chance, a barrister no longer briefless or lukewarm; and his eyes are opened to the existence of a mate in every way suitable and desirable for him.

The book differs most markedly from the work of the younger men we have named in having a quiet and not uncheerful philosophy, an elderly philosophy, if you like, more specifically embodied in the old justice, Sir Christopher Lance, but pervading the whole story. In short, its author might never have read a French or Russian novel; we never feel that his hero is an Ivan or Jean in disguise. He is English, his scene is English, his author is English. How comfortable, for a change!

Me. A Book of Remembrance. New York: The Century Co.

Personal narratives of this type are embarrassing to the reviewer, with his pigeon-holes. Shall he accept them at their face value as bits of autobiography or construe them as pieces of realism in a familiar disguise? Since its beginnings, with Defoe, the English novel has always been setting its critics that poser. The present story is circumstantial in its assurances. It is furnished with an introduction by Miss Jean Webster (author of "Daddy Long-Legs"), vouching for its character as a "human document." It is also an "astounding literary feat," having been written, according to its sponsor, in a hospital, in a space of two weeks—a hundred thousand words! It could be so written, says Miss Webster, because it was "pure reporting." Nevertheless, she admits that the writer is a novelist and a successful one; and we doubt if the novelist ever existed who could make a piece of pure reporting out of the events of his own life. However closely he may stick to his material, there will come moments when, willy-nilly, the figure of his former self becomes "our hero," an object of art. If this be a true story, it is a story told not by a plain citizen, but by a professional story-teller; and therefore of but moderate value as a human document.

It is the story of a year or so out of the life of a girl of seventeen. She is the daughter of an English younger son and ne'er-do-well, who has literally gone to seed in Canada. Her adventure begins as reporter and general factotum of a Jamaica newspaper. She is driven from the island by the advances of a negro magnate, and from a momentary secretaryship to a Richmond physician by similar advances on the part of her employer. She flies to the protection of another Richmond gentleman whom she has met on a train and at once fallen in love with. He sends her to Chicago with a hundred dollars. She becomes a stockyards stenographer, and presently repays the loan. Thereafter he besieges her in cynical fashion, accepting the love she childishly offers him, but not technically taking advantage of it up to the moment when she discovers him to be a pretty thoroughly bad lot, hopelessly involved in sex-intrigues during the very

period of her devotion to him. She herself, while in love with him, has become engaged to three men at a time—but this, she assures us, out of pure good nature and disinclination to give pain. Well, that is not impossible, to seventeen. There is something fine and sound about her, which has protected her even in her love for a skilled libertine; and we leave her at the moment of her escape, confident that she can take care of herself, even though her chosen asylum happens to be New York city.

PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION.

The History and Economics of Transport. By Adam W. Kirkaldy and Alfred Dudley Evans. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons. 7s. 6d. net.

This book was written primarily to assist in the systematic study of transportation problems in the new commercial schools of Great Britain. It includes not only the history and problems of railway transportation, but those of canals and ocean transport as well, including a suggestive chapter on the economics of marine fuel. Frequent references are made to the situation in other countries, with the result that there are interesting comparisons, but in the main attention is concentrated on Great Britain. The authors avoid as a rule any emphatic expression of opinion on controverted questions, contenting themselves rather with a full statement of the conflicting points of view. They have produced a well-balanced and satisfactory treatment of the subject, which will find many interested readers outside the class for which it was prepared, because it makes available the latest developments in England in the problems of management and regulation. The book was written before the outbreak of the war and contains therefore no reference to England's newest experiment with state control beyond a note in the appendix. In this brief reference the authors reach the conclusion that as an example of state ownership the experience of the last few months has been of no value. "A Government system that could not do better than this would never be tolerated in this country."

Of most interest to American readers are the comments of the authors on questions of policy that touch our own problems. The business community of England appears not to be wholly content with its Railway and Canal Commission, not because of its lack of ability or fairness, but because of the cost of proceedings before it. Traders are compelled to employ high-priced counsel to contend against the eminence of the railway legal staff. As a result only large corporations bring their cases before the Commission. It is not surprising that there is some agitation for the abolition of this exclusive court.

Pools and working agreements are common in England and are frequently referred to by advocates of a similar policy in this country. While the authors, following their

settled policy, express no decided opinion, it becomes clear that pools are not working there with the smoothness that we commonly assume. From the point of view of the shipper, they possess few advantages and many disadvantages, and it is suggested that Parliament may have to step in if further development takes place along undesirable lines. There is a familiar ring in the contention that the railways of England have reached the point of "diminishing returns" in their earnings; that the companies have been investing more capital without obtaining a proportionately increased return, and that increases in rates to meet increased costs of operation, particularly in the matter of wages, have become necessary.

A chapter is devoted to the railways of the United States, which is in general accurate in its facts and sound in its conclusions. Yet a few inaccuracies occur. The word grange, improperly spelled "grainge," did not, as the authors assert, come into use because the meetings were held in "grainges or barns"; but simply because "grange" means farm, and the membership was confined to farmers. It is not true that the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to arbitrate labor disputes. Confusion was doubtless caused by the fact that the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission was at one time a Government mediator in labor controversies. Any one who attempts to compare rates in different countries must step warily to avoid the pitfalls in his attempt to thread the mazes of the problem. The authors have not been altogether successful. Lacking ton-mile figures, they have compared receipts per ton carried in the United Kingdom and the United States and have shown that the cost per ton in this country is approximately twice as great as that in Great Britain. They recognize that this is not due to a lower efficiency of American roads, but to the greater distance that goods are hauled in this country. But then comes this conclusion: "It follows, therefore, that notwithstanding the complaints of excessive rates, cost of transport is not here the burden that it is in America, because the goods transported do not have to travel so far." In other words, we buy a shoddier coat in England than you do in America; hence our clothing bill is less of a burden to us than it is to you. To have this argument possess validity, it would be essential that the same traffic should be hauled long distances in the United States and short distances in England. As a matter of fact, much of the more important English traffic has undergone a preliminary foreign rail journey and an ocean trip of many thousand miles.

But it will be a satisfaction to our railway executives to find this final summing up of the American railway situation: "Any one who has little more than a bowing acquaintance with its history, extent, and achievements will agree that from some points of view it is one of the most efficient, best organized, and cheapest systems in the world."

England's inland waterways, it is assert-

ed, are a comparatively neglected and insignificant means of transport. To follow the European procedure and subsidize them would mean a complete reversal of national policy; and even if subsidized, they could do no business unless the railways were forbidden to compete, and such an injunction would be impracticable without government ownership.

TRIBAL CUSTOMS OF AGRICULTURE.

Customary Acres and their Historical Importance. By Frederic Seebohm. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$4 net.

When he published "The English Village Community" in 1883 Seebohm opened a new and illuminating page in agrarian history. Violently opposed at first, his main contention, that the agricultural system of mediæval England is to be traced back beyond the Anglo-Saxon invasion to the Roman occupation, has steadily gained adherents. Though he turned aside to write on the tribal system in Wales, tribal custom in Anglo-Saxon law, and other subjects, he continued his studies in agricultural origins, and in his latest volume goes back to tribal customs of agriculture in Europe which must have antedated even the Roman conquest of Gaul. Though death overtook him two years ago at the age of seventy-eight before he had completed his inquiry, he was able, fortunately, to arrange such results as he had reached in a series of unfinished but valuable essays which are published by his son.

Customary acres in England vary in size all the way from the tiny Leicestershire acre of 2,308 square yards to the great Welsh acre of 12,960 square yards. These customary acres reach back into a dim past, ages before the establishment of the statute acre of 4,840 square yards. In France the arpent shows similar variations in size. What is the origin and significance of these variations which have persisted through the centuries? Starting with the famous linear table in the Welsh Venedotian code that there are

- 3 barleycorn lengths in the thumb,
- 3 thumbs in the palm,
- 3 palms in the foot,
- 3 feet in the pace,
- 3 paces in the leap, and
- 3 leaps in the land,

Seebohm reckoned that the "land" is the short end of the acre-strip in the open-field system of ploughing, the acre-strip being the amount of land which an eight-ox plough-team would plough in a day. By a series of ingenious calculations, based primarily on the length of the furrow and the shape of the acre-strip, he found remarkable underlying relations between the ancient land and linear measurements not only of the British Isles, but also of France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Rumania, and even ancient Egypt. The old British mile, for instance, is identical with the Gallic leuga of 1,500 paces; both are related to the furrow of a custom-

ary acre, and both were so firmly fixed in local custom that they were not displaced by the Roman mile of 1,000 paces.

Lack of space forbids any attempt to explain Seebohm's metrological discoveries, and it is too soon to say whether further researches will verify his seductive suggestions. Quite apart from the value which they may have in determining the meaning, according to the metric system, of a large number of words of measurement in the sources, Seebohm's suggestions are pregnant with meaning for the student of early tribal migrations and borrowings and of the gradual economic development of primitive communities. The customary acre was not primarily a unit of land measure; it was a unit of land cultivation; its size, therefore, was determined by the nature of the crop, the soil, the communal plough, and the prevailing tribal customs of co-aration. It contains within itself an epitome of the steps in agrarian development. When it is more fully understood, it may be that we can throw overboard the old reckoning of archaeologists, who talk of ages of stone, of bronze, and of iron, and adopt instead a more valuable institutional classification by modes of agriculture; when, for instance, we can reckon tribal development according to the use of barley, of spring wheat, and of winter wheat, or according to one-field, two-field, or three-field systems of planting.

Notes

Harpers issue to-day Sir Gilbert Parker's new novel, "The Money Master."

Scribners announce for immediate publication a new novel entitled "Felix O'Day," by F. Hopkinson Smith.

Among the new editions which the Revell Company announces for publication this autumn are: "The Birthday of Hope," by J. D. Jones; "The Law of the Tithe," by Arthur V. Babbs; "St. Cuthbert's," by Robert E. Knowles. The same house also announces "Studies in the New Testament," by Dr. A. T. Robertson.

The first edition in English of the Russian epic "The Armament of Igor" is about to be published by the Oxford University Press. The editor is Mr. L. A. Magnus, who has written a general introduction and gives a revised text, with translation, notes, and genealogical tables. The poem describes a disastrous foray by Igor Svyatoslavich in 1185.

Paul Elder & Co. announce for publication this month "The Architecture and Landscape Gardening of the Exposition," with an introduction by Louis Christian Mullgardt. The second volume of this work, entitled "The Sculpture and Mural Paintings of the Exposition," with an introduction by A. Stirling Calder, is also in preparation.

Books announced by Houghton Mifflin for publication September 18 are: "Letters on an Elk Hunt," by Elinore Pruitt Stewart; "Little Miss Grouch," a novel by Samuel Hopkins Adams; "The Children's Books of

Birds," by Olive Thorne Miller; "Nannette Goes to Visit Her Grandmother," by Josephine Scribner Gates; five volumes of The Riverside Uplift Series, including "The Cultivated Man," by Charles W. Eliot; "The Amateur Spirit," by Bliss Perry, and three books by George Herbert Palmer, "Self-Cultivation in English," "The Glory of the Imperfect," and "Trades and Professions." Three Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize essays in economics, which will also be ready, are "The Canadian Iron and Steel Industry," by W. J. A. Donald; "The Tin-Plate Industry," by Donald Earl Dunbar, and "Means and Methods of Agricultural Education," by Albert Leake. "The Song of the Lark," by Willa Sibert Cather, will be published in October.

The American-Scandinavian Foundation announces for publication two new volumes of the Scandinavian Classics for 1915, as follows: "Poems and Songs," by Björnsterne Björnson, translated from the Norwegian, in the original metres, with an introduction and notes, by Arthur Hubbell Palmer, and "Master Olof," by August Strindberg, translated from the Swedish, with an introduction, by Edwin Björkman.

"The Life, Diary, and Letters of Oscar Lovell Shafter," Associate Justice, Supreme Court of California, January 1, 1864, to December 31, 1868, has just been issued in a privately printed edition as a daughter's tribute to her father's memory, by Emma Shafter Howard.

To the publications of the Dramatic Museum of Columbia University will be added in October a second series on acting, viz.: "The Illusion of the First Time in Acting," by William Gillette, with an introduction by George Arliss; "Art and the Actor," by Constant Coquelin, translated by Abby Langdon Alger, with an introduction by Henry James; "Mrs. Siddons as Lady Macbeth and Queen Katherine," by H. C. Fleeming Jenkin, with an introduction by Brander Matthews; and "Reflexions on Acting," by Talma, with an introduction by Sir Henry Irving and a review by H. C. Fleeming Jenkin. A third series is in preparation to be issued in the autumn of 1916. It will contain the following four papers on play-making: "A Stage Play," by Sir William Schenck Gilbert, with an introduction by William Archer; "Discussions of the Drama," by Carlo Goldoni, selected, translated, and introduced by Hobart C. Chatfield-Taylor; "Theatrical Table-Talk," by J. W. von Goethe, selected, translated, and introduced by William W. Lawrence; "How Plays are Written," by Abraham Dreyfus, translated by H. H. Hughes, with an introduction by Brander Matthews.

Mr. Dunbar Rowland, director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, is editing for publication the official letter-books of William C. C. Claiborne, as Governor of Mississippi Territory, as Commissioner of the United States to receive the Province of Louisiana from the French Government, as Governor-General of the Province of Louisiana, as Governor of the Territory of Orleans, and as Governor of the State of Louisiana, embracing the years 1801-1816.

Amid the roar of shells and bombs it is cheering to learn that certain studies "gang

their auld gait," namely, the Publications of the [London] Philological Society. Quite as if there were no war, the Society has issued two volumes of decided value for students of English: "A Fifteenth Century Courtesy Book," edited by R. W. Chambers, together with "Two Fifteenth Century Franciscan Rules," edited by W. W. Seton; and "Lowland Scotch as Spoken in the Lower Strathearn District of Perthshire," by Sir James Wilson, with Foreword by W. A. Craigie. The contents of these two volumes are too technical for appreciation in the *Nation*. But the accompanying Presidential Address, delivered by Prof. W. P. Ker on May 7, is abundantly suited to our columns. In ten brief pages Professor Ker, with light but sure touch, brings out anew the singular personality of Jacob Grimm. The founder of German philology was, first and foremost, a man whom we can all afford to love and venerate. Professor Ker is absolutely just in his remark: "Philology with Jacob Grimm was part of a study to which I think he gives no particular name. It was history, it was Germany, it was the Middle Ages, the Humanities, Nature, the Human Race." Again: "Modern scholars, who dabble in small patches of Grimm's garden, may often be horrified at the courage of their founder; where he cannot find information, he goes on without it." Was it not Grimm who said that in wrestling with some problems one must even have the courage to fail? Still again: "Grimm's large additions to positive science seem at times like the result of chance. They come as a precipitate from the most extraordinary vague vapor of ideas—a strange enthusiastic religion, the worship of an imaginary golden age." Yes, Grimm was a genius, no lover of "schools"; whereas too many of his followers, especially in these days, are mere schoolmen, prone *jurare in verba magistri*. The few passages of Grimm's German quoted in the Address move the present writer to a fervent ejaculation. Will no one lay bare to American students the wonderful vigor and charm of Grimm's style? It speaks, not from brain to brain, but rather from heart to heart. Professor Ker mentions Grimm's good fortune as librarian to King Jerome at Wilhelmshöhe (Cassel): "He had the lightest of duties and plenty of time for his own reading." Fifty years later another eminent scholar, Grein, who did so much for the editing of Anglo-Saxon texts, was also librarian in Cassel, for the restored Electorate, and enjoyed "the lightest of duties and plenty of time for his own" editing. To the present writer Grein lamented deeply, in 1872, his transfer by the Prussian Government to Marburg. Even Prussian "efficiency," we note, may not be truly efficient. Professor Ker's Address may be had separately for one shilling.

Mr. Frank Harris has patronized a number of the great men of the earth, and now, from the memory of these condescending moments, writes a volume of "Contemporary Portraits" (Mitchell Kennerley; \$3.50). Renan sits at his feet and craves his critical commendation; praise is doled out ironically to the silly Frenchman, and the report ends with these words: "But it was not worth while to try to correct his illimitable conceit." Whistler reserved his best witticisms for the ear of Mr. Harris; Oscar Wilde depended on him; Sir Richard Burton poured out to him the secrets of his heart; Matthew Arnold sought advice from him, and so on. But the most astonishing admission in the book is the fact that Browning snubbed

him—not that Mr. Harris uses such a word of himself; he attributes his failure with Browning to “the poor, clouded mirror” of his, the interviewer’s, soul, and to other such elegant modesties, but to the reader it looks a little as if Browning had accomplished the impossible and snubbed him. Mr. Harris confesses in his Introduction that he writes from memory, and cares more for “spiritual divination” than for “verbal accuracy,” and the reader rather regrets that his divinatory art failed him when he came to write of Browning, for one must do Mr. Harris the justice to say that his divination is at least more entertaining than his veracity. Perhaps we do Mr. Harris a wrong in this delicate matter, but there are times when the lack of accuracy in his report seems to be more serious than verbal. Is it really true, for instance, that Carlyle whined quite so mawkishly to this Mr. Harris over the woes of his married life? Is it really decent—we waive the question of veracity—to publish to the world a confession of Carlyle’s about himself, which sounds, at least, like a clumsy revival of the Jewsbury-Froude scandal? That story ought to have been silenced once for all by Andrew Lang’s statement of the facts told him by Mrs. Carlyle’s physician. Mr. Harris threatens further disclosures on this unsavory topic at another time. Some friend from among the humble ranks of gentlemen ought to hint to him that he has said enough.

Mr. Harris attempts criticism in statecraft and literature, as well as portraiture. He scolds England for neglecting her geniuses, particularly for not placing Sir Richard Burton at the head of Egypt. He does not seem to understand that a good colonial governor is scarcely to be looked for in a genius who, according to this friend’s account, was a scholar of “pornographic” taste and “infernal pedantry,” and a man of “untamed appetites,” who died of gluttony. He liked Burton for these things, but poor Matthew Arnold’s decency apparently stung him to impotent fury. “Snobbish and vicious nonsense” is one of the pretty phrases he hurls at the dead critic. But something too much of Mr. Harris. It is a pity he could not eliminate himself from his portraits.

Little, Brown are putting out a number of booklets known as the Mind and Health series (\$1 each), which, according to the advertisement, are “written by eminent specialists and edited by H. Addington Bruce, and designed to present the results of recent research and clinical experience in a form intelligible to the lay public and medical profession.” “Sleep and Sleeplessness,” by the editor of the series, is now ready, as are also Dr. I. H. Coriat’s “The Meaning of Dreams” and Dr. J. J. Putnam’s “Human Motives.” Mr. Bruce has given a clear, simple, and brief account of the nature of sleep, the causes of dreams, nightmare, and somnambulism, and the proper treatment of insomnia. It is in his treatment of the latter subject that his book will be most useful, through its appeal to the sufferer to discard drugs and set himself to work at a systematic effort to get control of his own consciousness. In the earlier part of the work perhaps too much appeal is made to the latest results of modern science, and one gains the impression that the importance of monotony in inducing sleep and the fact that physical stimuli often produce dreams are “important discoveries that have been

made during recent years through psychological investigation.” Readers of Mr. Bruce’s previous writings will not be surprised to learn that, in explaining the various phenomena of sleep and dreams, the subconscious is worked for all it is worth. If the subconscious plays a prominent part in “Sleep and Sleeplessness,” it is the leading and almost the only actor in “The Meaning of Dreams.” For Dr. Coriat has swallowed Freud entire, and his book might be described as a popular and expurgated summary of the “Traumdeutung.” That it is expurgated is certainly a blessing, and it may safely be used as a textbook in a young ladies’ seminary. But most of the Freudian machinery has been preserved, and the “lay public and medical profession” can here learn all they need to know about those mysterious powers and mechanisms which, as Freud has discovered, determine our dreams—“the foreconscious,” “latent content,” “displacement,” “secondary elaboration,” “the censor,” and the rest. All these wonderful things are propounded as the solid results of an established science, with no hint that they are in any way subject to question—for has not Freud spoken? As say the Schoolmen, *Philosophus dixit*. The unsophisticated reader will wonder at many of the dream interpretations, and still more at the conclusions deduced, and he may be astonished even at the Freudian commonplace that all dreams, including the most distressing, are to be explained solely as the fulfilment of a wish. But he will learn that all difficulties vanish before the technique of psycho-analysis, with its various “mechanisms” and its agile use of symbols—as is admirably illustrated in many of Dr. Coriat’s examples, in one of which, for instance, the dream of a brother’s death by hanging is interpreted as the expression of the dreamer’s wish not to die of cancer, while in another a beard is taken to symbolize “a better knowledge of internal medicine.” With such free and skilful use of symbolism as this it is not difficult for a master of the psycho-analytic technique to force any and every dream under the Freudian formula.

Dr. Putnam’s book on “Human Motives” is a rather perplexing combination of the “Psycho-analytic Movement” with an attempt to prove the existence of God. The first chapter opens promisingly, pointing out the fact that most of our acts are from motives which we only half understand, and whose roots extend backward and outward quite beyond our ken. These motives “are mainly traceable to the conjoined action of two different and apparently antagonistic sets of tendencies,” namely, our rational aspirations and ideals, on the one hand, and, on the other, our inherited instincts and emotional repressions. It is in the discussion of the first of these that the author is led into the long philosophical disquisition which fills the second chapter, and which reminds the reader strongly of the Cartesian argument for the existence of God. From the sublime it is but a step to Freud, whose views are accepted with admiration after being somewhat softened down. Farther on there is an analysis of motives, which, though sound, adds nothing of importance to our knowledge, and certainly owes very little to the psycho-analytic method. The lessons of this recently discovered method are applied, in a separate chap-

ter, to the practical matters of the rearing and education of children—a chapter which, though fairly long and carefully written, contains little that has not been the common property of wise parents and teachers since the days of Noah. Doubtless it is true that the parent should encourage his child to talk confidentially, but not to talk too much; that the teacher should make his influence count with his pupil, but not as too strong a factor; that the child “should neither be flattered nor too much persuaded, nor too much indulged, nor too much dominated.” But fortunately the world did not have to wait for Freud and the psycho-analytic method before learning some of these things. In spite of which fact, this chapter on Educational Bearings is, in the reviewer’s opinion, the most important chapter in the book. For it makes plain the fact that “the results of recent research and clinical experience,” while certainly important for the medical profession in dealing with abnormal cases, do not throw such a flood of light on the affairs of every-day life as the advertisements of this and similar series of books on popular psychology would lead the eager reader to expect.

A certain melancholy attaches to the publication of the second series of three essays on “Germany in the Nineteenth Century” (Longmans, Green; \$1.25 net). Undertaken by the University of Manchester as a friendly eirenicon to dispel the cloud of English suspicion by the spread of sound knowledge regarding Germany, the first series met with considerable success. Then the war intervened to frustrate the hopes with which the enterprise had been put forth. The editors, however, have wisely deemed that a refusal to continue the work might give rise to misconception. The studies in the second series are printed as they were originally written, without any attempt to recast judgment in the light of the war. Dr. A. S. Peake writes on the “History of Theology,” beginning with Schleiermacher and ending with Ritschl, the two most important influences on German theology in the nineteenth century. Strauss, Baur, and the other rationalists who intervene also receive adequate attention. The system of Ritschl, according to Dr. Peake, was designed to meet the widespread lapse from faith by interpreting Christianity in a way acceptable to the modern mind. Ritschl emphasized the uniqueness of Christianity and the impossibility of understanding it except from the inside. It is surprising that the writer has not made more of Ritschl’s indebtedness to Lotze in the matter of “judgments of value” (*Werturteile*) and of his kinship with certain modern modes of thought, whether known as pragmatism, Bergsonism, or what not.

The section on “The History of Philosophy,” by Dr. Bosanquet, is almost too condensed for a sufficiently full understanding. The writer wishes merely to convey some impression of the main direction of philosophic growth. His own inclination is to the triple rhythm—creation, disintegration, recovery; that is to say, he believes that philosophic study is working towards a future metaphysic; but as this point is disputed in Germany, he is content to divide the century roughly into three periods: post-Kantian (i. e., Hegelian), neo-Kantian, and the contemporary period, which is eclectic, but in which

there is at least renewed talk of preparation for a metaphysic. "The History of Music," by F. Bonavia, deals only with the symphony and the opera, the two main achievements of the first and second halves of the century, respectively. There is no discussion of chamber-music or of the song. The symphony, according to this writer, is a form peculiarly suited to the German temperament, as it demands, besides inventive genius and imagination, a sense of order and a power of organization—qualities in which Germans have ever excelled. The nine symphonies of Beethoven placed Germany highest among all the musical nations, and the operas of Wagner have maintained her there. The possibility that the sceptre may be passing to other peoples (for example, the Russians) is not discussed. The commendable purpose and excellent tone of these articles make the slovenly spelling of the German words all the more regrettable.

In "India and the War" (Doran; \$1 net), Lord Sydenham, late Governor of Bombay, contributes a sketch of Indian history for a book chiefly valuable for the excellent illustrations it contains of the various units comprising the British Indian Army. Where ethnic and religious differences play so important a part in the welter of races of the Indian Empire, a classification of this kind is useful if aided by careful and discriminating artists. In the case of this little book the artists are observant of even the subtle differences that distinguish the uniform of one regiment from another. Scattered throughout these pictures of the troops are photographs of the leading native princes, many of whom are now at the front in personal command of the units they loyally offered. Including a résumé of opinion among native leaders regarding the war, the book offers appendices containing Lord Crewe's speech as Secretary of State for India, accepting the unanimous offer of India through the Viceroy to take part in the struggle, a message from King George, excerpts from the Indian press, and the Army Order of Gen. Willcocks welcoming the Indian troops on their arrival at the front. Curiously enough there is no mention in the book of the numbers sent by India, which we know to amount to 70,000 picked troops with their accessories: India has pledged herself to maintain this number despite the losses entailed by the war. A more pertinent criticism, however, is necessary. It is a pity that the opportunity offered in a book of this nature was not taken to elucidate the manner of fighting for which each race and regiment in the Indian army is, by custom and habit, noted. Since the entrance of these troops into the European theatre we have already become conversant with the *kukri* of the Gurkhas; much could have been made of the peculiar qualifications that divide the various races into their natural aptitudes as cavalry, infantry, and scouts, as well as of their methods of offence and their predilections for their native weapons.

To the literature of the land problem Sir Thomas P. Whittaker has contributed a most serviceable volume, "The Ownership, Tenure, and Taxation of Land" (Macmillan; \$3.75). Without pretending to original research, the author has brought together from many sources—historical, legal, and economic—a large collection of facts and principles, and

has then presented "the proper conclusions to be drawn from them." His purpose has been to provide for the general reader, long since lost in the mass of accumulated controversial literature, a convenient handbook and guide. This he has successfully accomplished. Against the historical, legal, and economic absurdities of the land reformers, whether land nationalizationists or single-taxers, he arrays an impressive mass of evidence which cannot fail to carry great weight with every fair-minded reader. Particularly useful are his quotations from the reformers themselves on the real purpose of their proposals, which in ordinary discussion is seldom stated obtrusively. Useful, too, in enforcing understanding of these matters is the reproduction (p. 209) of passages like that in which Henry George argues for repudiation of public debts. If the book does nothing else, it should clear up the grotesque misconception of historical facts contained in Cobden's celebrated speech of 1845, in which he sought to show that the land of England had been gradually relieved from almost all taxation. The author's own opinions are eminently sane and sensible. He sees both sides of the shield, he treats opposing views fairly, and he makes a distinct contribution to the better understanding of a difficult question.

"The Political Science of John Adams," by Correa Moylan Walsh (Putnam; \$2.25 net), is the first detailed and critical study that has been made of the political philosophy of a statesman who has been acclaimed, on the one hand, as the foremost constitutional lawyer of the American Revolution, and held up, on the other, as the most extreme embodiment of all that was narrow and provincial in the early Federalism. Adams's career as a political thinker falls into three fairly well marked periods. The first, from 1765 to 1786, embraces his practical activities in the achievement of independence and the organization of State governments, upon the latter of which, however, his influence was only indirect. Here he acquiesced in, though he did not accept, the Jeffersonian theory of political equality. The second period saw the publication of his most considerable work, the "Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States," called out by Turgot's criticism of the first State Constitutions and advocacy of a unicameral system; his "Three Letters to Roger Sherman" and "Discourses on Davila," and his "Correspondence with Samuel Adams on the Subject of Government," written in 1790, but not published until 1802. In the third period, with public life behind him, the extreme views which had helped to make him unpopular were modified, and the political system of the States and the nation was accepted as it stood. The burden of Adams's criticism of American government was directed against the notion that all men are created equal, and the embodiment of that idea in a popular government of a pure democratic type. The best legislature, as he conceived it, was one so constituted as to recognize the natural division of society into an aristocracy and a democracy; while the executive should spring from the legislature and be non-partisan. The model, of course, was the British Constitution, and Adams did not hesitate to urge the advantages of an hereditary governing class, and of political distinctions based upon family and wealth. He feared the influence of election upon the character of the Senate

and the Executive, at the same time that he apprehended the growth of extreme aristocracy in the Senate. Hence his interest in "checks and balances" as a means of restraining the ambitions of either department of the Government. The wonder is that a man with such essentially monarchical sympathies could ever have attained the Presidency. In a final chapter, the author urges that the Senate, the real object of which is to check democracy, should be made over into a council, which, shorn of much of its independent legislative power, would exert a mediating influence upon executive, legislature, and judiciary alike.

Science

GASTRONOMY IN AMERICA.

Bohemian San Francisco. By Clarence E. Edwards. San Francisco: Paul Elder & Co. \$1.25 net.

The School Kitchen Textbook. By Mary J. Lincoln. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 60 cents net.

The Nutrition of a Household. By Edwin Tenney Brewster and Lillian Brewster. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$1 net.

The Small-Family Cook Book. By Mary Denson Pretlow. New York: McBride, Nast & Co. 75 cents net.

Baltimore, New Orleans, and San Francisco are the three American cities most widely famed among epicures. Baltimore owes its preëminence largely to the fact that Chesapeake Bay provides terrapin, canvas-back ducks, and other delicacies in their perfection. In New Orleans the local flavor is due to Creole influences, while San Francisco owes its distinction as a gastronomic centre to a variety of causes, which are entertainingly described in Dr. Clarence E. Edwards's volume, the full title of which is "Bohemian San Francisco: Its Restaurants and Their Most Famous Recipes." There are hundreds of these restaurants, and, as in Paris, each of them specializes in some particular dish. The author's reminiscences go back far beyond the great fire (being a San Franciscan, he never says earthquake), and while he sadly admits that some things are not what they were before the destruction and rebuilding of the city, there are still abundant reasons why San Franciscans, away from home, "always want to get back to where they can get something to eat." They miss both the delicacy and the variety of flavors which the Italian, French, German, Mexican, and Oriental cooks in California impart to their dishes.

Dr. Edwards takes his readers in turn to the representative restaurants of each nationality, not merely the expensive ones, but the humbler kinds, in which often one gets tastier food for much less money. He also serves as guide to the fascinating fish and vegetable markets, in some of which the best and freshest food materials are sold at prices which explain why some of the

restaurants can give such good meals for so little money (for instance, a table d'hôte dinner of six or seven courses for 25 cents). The Italians lead along this line, and the author's remarks on their eating-places, sources of supply, and methods of cooking constitute the most entertaining of his pages, and the most valuable of them, too; for, surely, in these days of high cost of living, it is important to know why and how these foreigners in California "live twice as well as the average American family, at half the cost." These people "have studied gastronomy as a science, and they have imparted their knowledge to San Francisco." Nor do they depend much on importations of foodstuffs. Even their macaroni is made in California, and the much relished "Italian" ham comes from Virginia. In the last analysis, however, supremacy lies in this: that "there are two things that an Italian demands in eating, and they are fresh fish and fresh vegetables." For fish-eaters, San Francisco is a paradise; the variety of seafood is astonishing. The crawfish is brought from Portland, and from the South comes the abalone, which, whatever may be said about its toughness, makes an even better soup than the bird's-nests served in the Chinese restaurants, concerning which the author also has a good deal to say. With so much to choose from, and so much that is tempting, is it a wonder that all San Franciscans have adopted the Bohemian fashion of dining out a great deal, especially on Saturdays and Sundays?

Other American cities are beginning to wake up to the fact that "the preparation of food is something more than a necessary evil." Eloquent evidence as to this general gastronomic awakening is to be found in "The School Kitchen Textbook" of Mary J. Lincoln. When the first version of this admirable book was written, some thirty years ago, instruction in cooking in the public schools of America was in the experimental stage, the only work which had been done being in a Boston schoolroom under philanthropic management. There were practically no schools for the training of teachers of cookery, and the literature of the subject was almost non-existent. To-day, public instruction in cooking is given in thousands of schools; there are special colleges for the training of teachers of domestic science, and books on the subject are appearing in ever-increasing numbers. Mrs. Lincoln's volume is not a revision of her "Boston School Kitchen Textbook"; it is a new treatise, embodying the results of the latest investigations and research; and while it has for its subtitle "Lessons in Cooking and Domestic Science for the Use of Elementary Schools," it would be difficult to name another volume equally useful to the thousands who have to learn the art of cooking without the aid of a teacher. Some things there are which only personal experience can teach, such as the amount of heat required for baking and other ways of cooking; yet the two pages concerned with the subject (258-9) in this book contain invaluable hints. The art of

making a fire is discussed; there are pages on fireless cookers, ventilation of the kitchen, sweeping, dusting, dishwashing, laying the table, table manners, kitchen equipment, care of food, canning and preserving, as well as the best methods of cooking different viands, with plenty of recipes—in short, girls who learn all these things, in school or out, are in a fair way of becoming model housewives. Lucky husbands of the future!

More might have been said about the mineral matter in various foods and the importance of flavor as a guide to correct cooking. The subject of electric cooking is most inadequately disposed of in nine lines. These things will receive more attention in the next edition, no doubt, as will the list of books to be consulted by students, which is surprisingly incomplete. The subject of calories is also slighted, but that is no fault, too much attention having been given to it by recent writers, among them the authors of the third book on our list, "The Nutrition of a Household." Not only do they harp perpetually on calories in the body of the book, but there is an appendix of forty pages filled with tables of percentages of various nutrients. The writers, nevertheless, are frank enough to admit that "appetite and judgment are usually better guides than chemistry and arithmetic." They admit, further, that no eater of foodstuffs can possibly keep track of a dozen amino-acids and another dozen inorganic salts needed for a well-balanced dietary; and they add, sensibly: "The most that Science can advise, practically, is the shotgun method—a sufficient variety to make sure that, one thing with another, it covers all the ground. We limit the range of our foods at our peril." In view of the fact that lions devouring flesh, boars grubbing for roots, moose consuming leaves, and gorillas living on fruit are all equally strong, it is argued that all foodstuffs are equally good, in their place. The assertion that "there is no such thing as a fattening food" is not proved in these pages, nor are a number of other paradoxical statements which in some cases are contradictory. This book, on the whole, seems undigested, but there are a number of sensible and clever sayings in it, such as "cooking is part of the digestion"—an elemental truth overlooked by most Americans.

"The Small-Family Cook Book" does not differ materially from a hundred other useful kitchen manuals which methodically give recipes for the preparing of soups, meats, vegetables, salads, breads, and desserts. The measures given are for families of two or three persons. A few recipes are added of dishes most relished by Germans, and there are twenty pages of "Old Virginia Recipes," in which the assertion is made that, in Tide-Water Virginia, hams are always boiled, never baked. The author is so convinced—and with good reason—of the inferiority of our Western cornmeal to the Southern white water-ground meal, that she hesitated to include recipes made of cornmeal, because you can't make them unless you have the right meal.

Drama

MARIE TEMPEST AT THE LYCEUM.

Miss Tempest, like Miss Maude Adams, is a person of mannerisms. If you like them, they enrich and blend with her art, of which she has her due portion. But those who do not find these mannerisms attractive are apt to remember them too insistently and to begrudge her art the credit which it deserves. Piquancy, the basis of most of the rôles in which she has recently appeared, need not of necessity be jerky and precipitate. To gauge its possibilities one has only to think of various successful representations of Shakespearean heroines, from whom this quality is seldom absent. But if Miss Tempest's acting lacks reserve and quietness, it has personality always.

In the double bill in which she is to be seen at the Lyceum Theatre, she has plays evidently much to her liking. Robert Marshall's "Duke of Killicrankie," a drama not unknown to New York in the past, is one of those artificial creations which depend for their success upon substantial acting of the old-fashioned sort; it is a comedy of manners worked into situations the outcome of which is never for a moment in doubt. The Duke of Killicrankie, a young man of large estates, having met with obdurate refusal in the repeated advances he has made to Lady Henrietta, has decided to exhibit in heroic measure the determination which he has been accused of lacking, and so, by a vigorous pulling of wires, virtually incarcerates Lady Henrietta with himself, a friend of his, and the lady beloved of this friend in his castle in Scotland. Is it any wonder that Lady Henrietta and Mrs. Mulholland, when freed, decide to imprison themselves for life by marrying the two bold suitors?

Miss Tempest, taking the part of Mrs. Mulholland, the widow of a rich glue-manufacturer, has a chance to match wit against the usual outgivings of a lady of assured position. The part might have been played in several ways, but Miss Tempest's vigorous procedure held the audience and gave enjoyment. The parts of the two male performers were admirably filled by W. Graham Browne and Ferdinand Gottschalk.

Barrie's "Rosalind," a trifle comparable to his "Little Mary," is, for the most part, a dialogue between an actress (Miss Tempest) and a young Oxford graduate, who comes upon her during a summer vacation and fancies he is in love with this woman's daughter—for so much does "make-up" account! This is the playwright's central idea, yet he has left openings for tears as well as laughter. The lad's disillusionment, and the actress's, too, when she realizes how much she has aged by a mere change of costume, furnish moments for sober thought. On the whole, the comedy was played with the desired flourish and sprightliness, both by Miss Tempest and Mr. Denny.

F.

"OUR CHILDREN."

Theatre-goers who are particularly anxious for a play devoid of sex or shrapnel and are in a rocking-chair mood will find considerable gentle pleasure at this comedy in three acts by Louis K. Anspacher. The plot discloses the results of spoiling a son and bullying a daughter. Willybad Engel, a rich German shoe-manu-

facturer, gives Theodore everything he asks for, and drives from the house the devoted Hertha when she insists on marrying the foreman, Richard Hellman. The boy, a weakling, is ruined by speculation. He flies from the house to avoid the police, taking with him money belonging to his fiancée, a banker's daughter for whom he has thrown over a humbler sweetheart. Willybad's business is injured by strikes and his rivals are aided by Hellman's inventions. In the last act he is back at his workbench, a cobbler again. He now appreciates his daughter, yet refuses to see Hellman, who has secretly paid off Theodore's debts. But Christmas is come and all hearts are open for the reconciliation that includes Theodore's return to his first love.

The author has centred the interest in the characters rather than in the action. As this treatment of a theme is all too rare on Broadway these days, it is greatly to be regretted that he has not divided his attention in better proportion, and that he has given up so much of his priceless two hours to lines that have no value whatever. Several persons of importance are but faintly drawn; the qualities of others are needlessly reiterated. But it was the transparency of the scenes and speeches that made the audience inattentive; and that despite some very good acting. Emmett Corrigan supplied plenty of intelligence and force for the long rôle of "Uncle Willy." The most artistic performance was that of Albert Bruning as the old friend, "Stasi." The important part of the son—a type that has had several brilliant representations in the past—fell to Ralph Morgan. His hard work was unfortunately marred by sharp, jerky movements and diction, but the scene when he prepared for flight was very well played. In Spencer Hutton a new character was introduced to our stage—the bank president with a halo. In most of his speeches, however, Arthur Lewis threw a sop to tradition by assuming a sneaky look. Alphonz Ethier, as Hellman, was so good in his brief denunciation of Willybad that we wanted to see him tackle the old man again. B.

Music

LETTERS OF A FAMOUS VIOLINIST.

Letters from and to Joseph Joachim. Selected and translated by Nora Bickley. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$3.75 net.

Two years ago the letters written by and to the famous violinist, Joseph Joachim, were collected by his son and his biographer, Andreas Moser, and published in three large volumes, containing considerably over a thousand, although they did not include the correspondence with Brahms, which had been previously issued as the fifth and sixth volumes of Brahms's "Briefwechsel." As this includes 500 letters, Nora Bickley had, therefore, more than 1,500 to choose from when she decided to select and translate sufficient specimens of the correspondence of Joachim to make one volume in English. She has executed her task judiciously, making excellent translations of notes and epistles, most of which were evidently written without any idea that they would ever appear in print.

Joachim was for several decades at the head of the Joachim Quartet, probably the most famous organization of its kind the world has seen, and reputed unequalled, at least in the performance of the chamber music of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms. As a solo violinist he was, moreover, held to be an unrivalled interpreter of the sonatas and concertos of the same masters; nor was this all. As director of the Royal Academy of Music in Berlin he had opportunity to wield an influence second to that of no contemporary teacher. Like all modern players, he travelled a great deal, and in all these ways he came into contact with most of the distinguished musicians of his time. In turning over the pages of his correspondence one constantly comes across such names as Brahms, Liszt, Wagner, Schumann, Berlioz, Franz, Bargiel, Stephen Heller, Stanford, Max Bruch, etc., as writers or recipients.

It is a little surprising to find so few letters in this volume from or to English friends, for, like Handel and Mendelssohn, Joachim was esteemed in England perhaps even more than in Germany. The Brahms cult in England, which is now abating, was due more to his preaching and practice than to that of any other musician, and by his many appearances at the "Popular Concerts" he helped to inure the public at large to the strain of listening to serious music. In a preface to this volume, Mr. Fuller-Maitland expresses the opinion that Joachim's influence on the music of his time was great beyond all possibility of assessment; but this is a gross exaggeration. Apart from Brahms and Schumann, there was no neglected master for whom this violinist did missionary work. Even the romantic and prophetically modern Schubert was for a long time beyond the range of his limited sympathies, and the modern schools of composers, headed by Wagner and Liszt, he fought savagely to the end of his career.

Liszt was the object of his fiercest hatred, notwithstanding the fact that this master had lavished on him in his early career the same generous aid he gave to all who came to him. Readers of the letter dated August 27, 1857, in which Joachim tells Liszt how "entirely antagonistic" that master's music was to his ideals, will pronounce it frank or brutal, according to their sympathies. How far Joachim subsequently went in his aversion to Liszt is instanced in another letter, dated 1870, in which he tells Brahms (another of the conspirators against the "modern clique") that he has refused to take part in a projected Beethoven festival because Liszt had been chosen to conduct the "Missa Solemnis"! Well-informed musicians know that Liszt inaugurated almost as great and salutary a revolution in orchestral and choral conducting as in piano-playing; but to Joachim this invitation was a "flippant comedy"! Wagner, to be sure, considered Liszt the greatest of all interpreters of Beethoven, but in the opinion of Joachim Wagner was not much better than Liszt. He found something touching in the way Hans von Bülow

"sacrifices himself to Liszt and Wagner; it is a pity his good qualities cannot find a better channel for his enthusiasm." Joachim had absolutely no capacity for enjoying Wagner's operas, finding even "Die Meistersinger" a bore. For this he cannot be blamed; it was a matter of taste; but it was something different which, in 1870, made him write to Clara Schumann that, in his honest opinion, she "should on no account take part in a concert at which Wagner is conducting." That such a man should have been, until a few years ago, director of the leading German high school of music seems odd. It must have cost him a pang to write, in 1893, concerning his own daughter: "She went from here to Bayreuth to study some parts with Frau Cosima; for, of course, like all operatic singers, she is under the spell of Wagner's creations. It is no good opposing this nowadays."

Joachim's dearest friends were Robert and Clara Schumann and Brahms. Mme. Schumann's letters are the most interesting of all in this volume. She was a bundle of violent prejudices, and there is reason to believe that she had a good deal to do with turning Joachim against his former friend and benefactor, Liszt; but when she writes about her great husband, or her own pianistic tours and tribulations, she always holds the attention. The same cannot be said of the letters contributed by Brahms. Twenty-five of them are included, and most of them are dull. "I am no letter-writer," he says in one of them, and he was right. In his letters, as well as in those of Joachim and Clara Schumann, there are echoes of a temporary estrangement between Brahms and the other two. "Brahms is egoism incarnate," Joachim writes, and Mme. Schumann bears witness that sometimes he "made life with him almost unbearable." They seem to have had a good deal of trouble, too, in persuading Brahms to keep up his piano practice, so that he would do himself justice when playing in public. Of this playing Joachim had a high opinion, but what he says about it bears out what Wagner and others maintained: that it was dryly intellectual, without a trace of feeling. It is amusingly characteristic of Joachim himself that he admires Brahms's playing because it is "so light and clear, so cold and indifferent to passion"! It has always been held that those composers and authors are the greatest who give the deepest expression to the joys and woes of mankind; but Joachim evidently thinks he is paying Brahms another compliment when he adds: "His compositions, too, are an easy treatment of the most difficult forms—so pregnant, rejecting all earthly sorrows with such indifference."

Concerning Joachim's own efforts at composition some interesting details may be found in this correspondence. He sent his overture to "Hamlet" to Liszt, dedicating it to him and expecting him to perform it. Liszt was kind enough to praise it, and to encourage the young man along this line; but the audiences were less tolerant. To Bargiel, who urged him to have his compo-

sitions performed in Berlin, he wrote: "The manner in which they have been received in Düsseldorf, Weimar, Leipzig, and Cologne gives me no reason to suspect that my compositions would be sympathetically received in Berlin." However, he consoled himself after the fashion of his friend Brahms, who, when his first piano concerto was, to cite his own words, "a brilliant and decisive failure" in Leipzig, being even hissed, although he himself was at the piano, wrote to Joachim: "I believe this is the best thing that could happen to one; it forces one to concentrate one's thoughts and increases one's courage. After all, I am only experimenting and feeling my way as yet."

HENRY T. FINCK.

Finance

OUR MARKETS, AND BELLIGERENT EUROPE.

Throughout the recent period of reaction from the high hopes of reaching a permanent understanding with Germany, whereby the outrages of her submarine campaign should be abandoned, the Stock Exchange has refused to express alarm. International houses expressed, in the private conversation of their members, grave doubts as to the outcome of the Dumba episode and the latest German communication on the Arabic; but the investment markets continued unruffled. This attitude undoubtedly embodied the conviction that, while Germany is the foremost military Power of the day, and England the foremost naval Power, the United States is the foremost Power in international finance, and that Germany is well aware of it. Germany, it is further assumed, is no less aware that, while her own military prestige still remains to be finally tested, the naval predominance of England in the war is unchallenged, and the financial predominance of the United States is acknowledged by all the world.

This happens, moreover, at the very moment when all the belligerent states are considering very seriously how they can go on raising money to conduct the war on its present scale, and where they will get the money to reconstruct their own affairs when war is over. Berlin has shown signs of understanding that the way to prepare for these coming problems is not through forcing a breach of all friendly relations with the Power which holds the key to the financial situation.

There appears to be little doubt in the American financial mind that the responsible heads of government at Berlin recognized this phase of our own situation in their recent efforts at coming to terms with our State Department on the submarine controversy. It was undoubtedly a matter of perplexing conjecture, to Wall Street as to every one else, what had happened at Berlin to cause the virtual *volte-face* in last week's communication on the Arabic.

There are those who will suggest that a family resemblance exists between the German Government's defence of the submarine commander, because he "became convinced that the steamer had the intention of attacking him," and the same Government's labored explanations, thirteen months ago, that German armies were invading Belgium because they were "convinced" that the French armies "had the intention" of doing so.

Both excuses smack of a General Staff, rather than of a serious Foreign Office; they might mean that von Tirpitz is shaping German policy to-day where Bethmann-Hollweg was shaping it two weeks ago. All this was necessarily conjecture. But it did not alter the underlying fact, made perfectly plain in the letter sent to our Government through Count Bernstorff, that the German Government, if the army and navy cabal is once eliminated as a controlling influence, does not wish and will not provoke a breach with the United States.

This increasing strength of the American economic position continues to be enhanced, even in the face of the negotiations for a \$500,000,000 loan to the French and English markets, by the extraordinary movement of gold to the United States—a movement whose significance will not have escaped the attention of the German financiers and Government. In the case of each of the three large blocks of gold, received by New York from London during the past five weeks and amounting to \$19,500,000 apiece, no notice of their shipment from England was given, and the Bank of England's weekly reports showed no sign that any of the gold thus sent had been obtained from its vaults. Last Monday, however, the cables reported \$11,900,000 gold withdrawn from the Bank for export to New York. This would seem to mean that the share in the movement allotted to the Bank of France and the London joint-stock banks had been for the time performed, and that the Bank of England was called upon to do its part.

The New York bank statement of Saturday, with its report of cash holdings \$100,000,000 above what they were at the end of May—only fifteen weeks ago—gave one reflection of this extraordinary westward flow of gold. The statement of the Federal Reserve banks provides another. The gold reserve of these institutions now stands \$18,000,000 above that of July 1 and \$53,000,000 above January 1. Yet the increase in their rediscounts, for the year to date, has been only \$32,000,000, and the increase in note circulation \$13,000,000. Facilities of the new banking system for sustaining local credits or providing for movement of the crops have as yet been virtually untouched. The movement of European gold into our markets continues on a scale which seems still further to postpone the need of any large application of its machinery—which nevertheless remains as a further potential element of strength, when the financial resources of the country are called on to help repair the economic waste of Europe.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

- Birmingham, G. A. *Minnie's Bishop*. Hodder & Stoughton. \$1.20 net.
 Brainerd, E. H. *Pegeen*. Century. \$1.25 net.
 Charters, A. V. *Marie Tarnowska*. Century. \$1.50 net.
 Kingsley, F. M. *The Heart of Philura*. Dodd, Mead.
 McCutcheon, G. B. *Mr. Bingle*. Dodd, Mead. \$1.35 net.
 Marshall, A. *The Old Order Changeth*. Dodd, Mead. \$1.35 net.
 Mason, A. E. W. *Lawrence Clavering*. Dodd, Mead.
 Milne, A. A. *Happy Days*. Doran. \$1.25 net.
 Morris, G. *When My Ship Comes In*. Scribner. \$1.35 net.
 Paine, R. D. *The Twisted Skein*. Scribner. \$1.35 net.
 Palmer, B. E. *The Single-Code Girl*. Lothrop, Lee. \$1.25 net.
 Palmer, J. *Peter Paragon*. Dodd, Mead. \$1.35 net.
 Reizenstein, E. L. *On Trial*. Dodd, Mead. \$1.25 net.
 Somerville, E. C., and Ross, M. *In Mr. Knox's Country*. Longmans, Green. \$1.35 net.
 Tolstoy, L. *The Death of Ivan Ilyitch*. Lane. \$1.35 net.
 Wells, H. G. *The Research Magnificent*. Macmillan. \$1.50 net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- Björnson, B. *Poems and Songs*. Scandinavian Classics. American Scandinavian Foundation. \$1.50 net.
 Curry, S. S. *How to Add Ten Years to Your Life*. The Smile. Boston: Expression Company. \$1 each.
 Hawkes, C. *Hitting the Dark Trail*. Holt. \$1 net.
Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society. New series. Vol. XV. London: Williams & Norgate.
 Robinson, F. B. *Effective Public Speaking*. La Salle Extension University.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

- Bailey, L. H. *The Holy Earth*. Scribner. \$1 net.
 Hunting, H. B. *The Story of Our Bible*. Scribner. \$1.50 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

- Hamilton, W. H. *Current Economic Problems*. University of Chicago Press. \$2.75 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

- Andler, C. *Le Pangermanisme*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.
 Fanshawe, R. *By Yser Banks*. England: B. H. Blackwell. 1s. net.
 Hamerton, J. A. *The Real Argentine*. Dodd, Mead. \$2.50 net.
 Howe, F. C. *Socialized Germany*. Scribner. \$1.50 net.
 Koebel, W. H. *The South Americans*. Dodd, Mead. \$3 net.
 Kusel, Baron de. *An Englishman's Recollections of Egypt, 1863-1887*. Lane. \$3 net.
 O'Regan, J. R. K. *The German War of 1914*. Oxford University Press.
Reports on the Violation of the Rights of Nations and of the Laws and Customs of War in Belgium. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
The Glory of Belgium. Edited by Russell Markland. London: Erskine MacDonald. 2s. 6d. net.
 Wagner, Richard. *My Life*. Authorized translation from the German. Vols. I and II. Dodd, Mead. \$3.50 net.
 Verhaeren, E. *Belgium's Agony*. Houghton Mifflin. \$1.25 net.

POETRY.

- Fleming, W. K. *Dreams and Realities*. London: Erskine MacDonald.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

- Clark, B. H. *Contemporary French Dramatists*. Stewart & Kidd Co.
 Lindsey, W. *Red Wine of Roussillon*. Houghton Mifflin. \$1.25 net.
 Mackay, C. D. *The Beau of Bath and Other One-Act Plays*. Holt. \$1.20 net.

Strindberg, A. Master Olof. Scandinavian Classics. American Scandinavian Foundation. \$1.50 net.

TEXTBOOKS.
Deering, R. W. Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. New edition. Heath. 75 cents.

Greenlaw, E. Familiar Letters. (Lake English Classics). Scott, Foresman. 40 cents net.

HITTING THE DARK TRAIL

Starshine Through
Thirty Years of Night

By

CLARENCE HAWKES

With an Introduction by Dallas Lore Sharp.
Illustrated, \$1.00 net.

The remarkable autobiography of Clarence Hawkes, who lost the sight of both eyes in his early teens and who pluckily and successfully has made the best of his affliction. It is a moving and inspiring story of courage triumphant.

 **HENRY HOLT AND CO.** 34 W. 33d St.
PUBLISHERS OF **THE UNPOPULAR REVIEW** New York

A TEXT BOOK OF THE WAR FOR AMERICANS

By J. Wm. White, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

"It is undoubtedly the most effective compilation of facts, quotations, and citations yet contributed to the vast literature on this subject. As an effective argument, it is a cross between the 42-centimeter cannon and the French 75—tremendously destructive like the former, and smooth in action like the latter."
—*Ex-Attorney-General James M. Beck.*

\$1.00 net at Bookstores or from the Publishers
THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO., Philadelphia

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CATALOGUE OF THE PRINTED WORKS ILLUSTRATED BY GEORGE CRUIKSHANK

By ALBERT M. COHN, B.A. (Oxon.) Royal 8vo. \$5.00 net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lists of publications in sciences, philosophy, philology, history, economics, will be sent upon request.

The University of California Press
BERKELEY, CAL.

THE LONDON NATION says of THE DEATH OF A NOBODY by JULES ROMAINS:

"An exquisite tour de force. Let no lover of intellectual excitement hesitate to turn to it." \$1.25 net
B. W. HUEBSCH PUBLISHER NEW YORK

How the Panama Canal Was Made Possible
SANITATION IN PANAMA
By Major-General William C. Gorgas.
A remarkable account of the work of sanitation accomplished by Major-General Gorgas in the elimination of yellow fever in Panama. Illustrated \$2.00 net.
D. Appleton & Company, Publishers, New York

DO YOU READ HALLET?

"At last a writer worthy to be mentioned in the same breath with Joseph Conrad as an interpreter of the sailor and the sea. . . . The author of 'The Lady Aft' is boldly individual. To those who prize that quality, Mr. Hallet should be the most precious discovery in American fiction of recent years."—*Boston Herald.*

Read Richard Matthews Hallet's graphic novel of the sea

THE LADY AFT

Illustrated by S. M. Chase. \$1.35 net

At All Booksellers

Small, Maynard & Company

Publishers Boston
Send for our book catalogue

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE WAR

Neutral Rights, Belligerent Claims and American Commerce, in the Years 1914-1915

By EDWIN J. CLAPP.

Professor of Economics, New York University.

This book, the first authoritative work showing the actual effect of this country of the great European struggle, discloses how international lawlessness affects America, as a type of the neutral nations of the world.

It is non-partisan in tone, though impartial and severe in its condemnation of the belligerent actions that have brought about the present situation. While intended for the general reader, the book preserves the scientific spirit necessary to judgment on the great questions involved.

Price \$1.50 net.

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

209 ELM STREET, NEW HAVEN, CONN. 225 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.



The Cochran is just a short walk from the White House, Department Buildings, Churches, Theatres, Hotels and Shopping district.

A hotel that you will visit a second time.

Make the Cochran your home while in Washington, whether permanent or transient.

Moderate rates considering the excellent service.

EUGENE S. COCHRAN, Manager

COCHRAN HOTEL
14th & K STREETS, N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C.

The Aims and Defects of College Education

Comments and Suggestions by Prominent Americans

An Original Investigation

By Foster Partridge Boswell, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology and Education in Hobart College

With an Introduction by

GEORGE EASTMAN

President of the Eastman Kodak Company

The Hobart College Series, Vol. 1.

12". 80 cents net.

Analyzes the opinions secured from representative men respecting the shortcomings of college education, the aims it should strive for, and the ways in which it could be made more helpful to the students it graduates and the community of which these students form a part.

All Booksellers

New York **G. P. Putnam's Sons** London

Mind and Health Series

Edited by H. Addington Bruce

A series of medical handbooks written by eminent specialists and designed to present the results of recent research in a form suitable for the lay public's reading.

Human Motives

By JAMES J. PUTNAM, M.D.

The Meaning of Dreams

By ISADOR H. CORIAT, M.D.

Sleep and Sleeplessness

By H. ADDINGTON BRUCE, A.M.

\$1.00 net per volume

LITTLE, BROWN & COMPANY
Publishers Boston, Mass.

JUST OUT THE STORY OF A PIONEER

BY DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

"Dr. Shaw is one of the great American personalities, and the story of her life is vital." \$2.00 net.

HARPER & BROTHERS

THIS MAGAZINE IS PRINTED BY



20 VESEY STREET, NEW YORK

PREPAREDNESS

Are we prepared to defend our country? If not, do we know why, what is lacking, what should be done? "Efficiency for Defense" is an expert's report on the needs and methods of our national defense. Every American will be interested in this powerful article which reviews us before ourselves in the September 18th issue of

Collier's ^{5¢ a copy}
THE NATIONAL WEEKLY
416 West 13th Street, New York City

CANADIAN FINANCE

An Independent Journal

Investment, Banking, Insurance, Trade, Public Affairs

S. R. TARR, M.A.,
Managing Editor.

WINNIPEG, CANADA

Annual Subscription in
United States, \$2.50

¶ Since the outbreak of the war, the United States has been Canada's banker to the extent of nearly \$150,000,000—over and above one-half billion dollars previously invested in the Dominion.

¶ American investors are finding more and more to interest them in the columns of CANADIAN FINANCE, a publication that has come to be recognized as at once reliable, well-balanced, fearless—and readable.

¶ Published "where East meets West," it is notably the one journal that surveys Canadian investments without sectional bias.

¶ Knowing that the readers of The Nation do not include the idly curious, the publishers of CANADIAN FINANCE will be glad to send the journal with their compliments for one month to anyone making request upon blank printed below.

The Publishers, CANADIAN FINANCE, WINNIPEG, CANADA.

You may send me your publication for one month, no charge or obligation upon my part being involved.

Name

Address



The Bellman

An Illustrated Weekly
of Distinctive Character

"Good wine needs no bush"

Sample copy sent on receipt
of request by

THE BELLMAN COMPANY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., U. S. A.

Read

The World in the Crucible

By SIR GILBERT PARKER.
The well-known novelist and member of Parliament
AT ALL BOOKSTORES, \$1.50 net.
DODD, MEAD & CO., NEW YORK

Read

L. M. Montgomery's new "ANNE" book ANNE OF THE ISLAND

A SEQUEL TO
"ANNE OF GREEN GABLES" 310th thousand
"ANNE OF AVONLEA" 109th thousand

M. A. B. (Mainly About Books)

An illustrated monthly magazine containing excerpts and specimen illustrations from the best new English Books, literary gossip and authors' photographs. A copy will be sent to you post free for twelve months on receipt of 50 cents.
T. FISHER UNWIN, Ltd.,
1 Adelphi Terrace, London, England